REPORT RESUMES

ED 019 048 JC 680 119

EXPLORING THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR, PROCEEDINGS OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATIVE TEAMS INSTITUTE (1ST, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, JULY 31-AUGUST 5, 1961).

FLORIDA UNIV., GAINESVILLE

PUB DATE 61

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.36 57P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION, INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES, EDUCATIONAL FINANCE, PRIVATE FINANCIAL SUPPORT, FACULTY RECRUITMENT,

IN A CONFERENCE OF 107 PRESIDENTS AND OTHER ADMINISTRATORS FROM 42 JUNIOR COLLEGES IN THE SOUTHEASTERN STATES, ATTENTION WAS GIVEN TO (1) THE OVERALL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE, (2) THE PURPOSES, OPERATION, AND ADMINISTRATION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES, (3) INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, (4) MANAGEMENT, WITH EMPHASIS ON FINANCES, AND (5) FACULTY RECRUITMENT AND PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION. (WO)

ED019048

ERIC

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 5 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

XPLORING THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR

Proceedings of the First
Junior College Administrative
Teams Institute
July 31-August 5, 1961

UNDER A GRANT RECEIVED FROM THE W. K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EXPLORING THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR

Proceedings of the First
Junior College Administrative Teams Institute
July 31-August 5, 1961
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

UNDER A GRANT RECEIVED FROM THE W. K. KELLOGG FOUNDATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Daily Program Summary iv

Conference Planning Committee v

Personnel of the Conference v

Introduction vi

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
by Dr. R. L. Johns 1

STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK: ITS PLACE IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE
by Dr. Melvene Hardee 6

NEGLECTED OPPORTUNITIES IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE
by Dr. B. Lamar Johnson 13

MANAGEMENT IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE
by Dr. Duncan Wimpress 25

FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
by Dr. Kenneth R. Williams 33

A PROPOSAL FOR A LONG-RANGE PROJECT TO STUDY JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION IN THE SOUTHEASTERN UNITED STATES
by Dr. W. Hugh Stickler 39

A LOOK BACKWARD OVER THE WEEK'S ACTIVITIES AND A LOOK FORWARD
by Dr. B. Lamar Johnson 43

Registered Institutions and Delegates 48

DAILY PROGRAM SUMMARY

Daily Schedule

A.M.	
9:30	General Session
9:30	Major Address
10:15	Break
10:45	Small-group Discussions on Day's Topic
11:45	Lunch
P.M.	
1:00	Continue Small-Group Discussions
2:00	General Session Five-minute report from each group leader Twenty-minute panel (Six group leaders) to respond to questions from the floor
3:00	Break
3:30	Institutional teams meet individually and discuss In-Service Projects

CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Aaron Jones
R. L. Johns
Raymond Schultz
Harvey K. Meyer
Willis LaVire
Robert Wiegman
B. Lamar Johnson

PERSONNEL OF THE CONFERENCE

Welcome	Harry Philpott, Vice President, University of Florida
Small-Group Recorders	H. Kastner L. Cooper A. Adkins D. Montgomery E. Cottrell Wm. Hoppe
Small-Group Leaders	Kenneth Williams Marshall Hamilton Joseph Fordyce Duncan Wimpress Michael Bennett Glenn Bushey
Consultants	LeRoy Good Melvene Hardee Lee Henderson R. L. Johns B. Lamar Johnson Harvey K. Meyer Raymond Schultz W. Hugh Stickler James Wattenbarger Robert R. Wiegman

INTRODUCTION

The first Junior College Administrative Teams Institute, sponsored by the University of Florida and Florida State University under the terms of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation Grant, was held on the campus of the University of Florida, July 31-August 5, 1961.

One hundred and seven junior college presidents and administrators from forty-two public and private junior colleges in the twelve southeastern states discussed their mutual problems, opportunities, and future plans with a team of consultants headed by Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, University of California, Los Angeles.

This report contains the major addresses delivered during the Institute.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES

by R. L. Johns
Professor of Educational Administration
Head of Department
University of Florida

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: There is no group that I had rather address than this group for the simple reason that I think you people represent the frontier of education in the United States. As a matter of fact, you represent somewhat the frontier of education in the world because not only in the United States but throughout the world there is a resurgent interest in broadening and extending education.

My specific interest in junior colleges started about sixteen years ago when I was engaged as a consultant to the Florida Citizens Committee on Education. It was the period immediately following World War II. We knew that we faced a new world. We had boys who had been all over the world and who had achieved new ambitions, new perspectives, and new aspirations. We had a new birthrate structure which was entirely different from what it had been in the 30's and in the early 40's and we saw that people now had different ideas about what they wanted to do. I noted recently a survey of a random sample of people who had five and six year old children. This survey showed that 65 to 70 per cent of these people indicated that they wanted to send their children to college. Fifty years ago, I do not believe that over five per cent of the population at that time considered sending their children to college. But now instead of a college education or post secondary education being an exceptional thing it is in general demand, much as the demand for secondary education became general after World War I.

The Florida Citizens Committee on Education studied this problem as well as many other education problems. The Committee recommended the establishment of a system of junior colleges as a part of the Minimum Foundation Program. Dr. E. L. Morphet and I worked with the Citizens Committee in drafting the junior college law. It was a crude law — it had lots of rough spots in it, but it had the dream in it that we would have a state-wide system of junior colleges which would be accessible to everybody.

Shortly after that time a young student, James Wattenbarger, came to the University who wasinterested in doing graduate work in junior college education. He had graduated from a junior college and completed his undergraduate program at the University. We didn't have a program at the University for training people for junior college leadership. Nevertheless, he wrote both his master's thesis and his doctor's dissertation in the area of junior college organization and administration. Actually he did part of his graduate study at the University of Califfornia in Berkeley because of the meager offerings at the University of Florida. Since that time we have developed a comprehensive program for training junior college leaders at the University and Dr. Wattenbarger has become Director of the Division of Community Junior Colleges in the State Department of Education.

Prior to World War II the four year colleges in Florida were competing fiercely for students, and they looked with a fishy eye at any institution which would compete with them for enrollment. For example, the University of Florida Chapter of the American Association of University Professors was highly suspicious of the new junior college law in 1947. The chapter called me before them shortly after the passage of this law, and I met a very unfriendly group. They thought that we were going to set up a competitive situation which would cut the enrollment of the University to the point that it would be unfavorable, and they didn't like it at all. I am happy to state that since that time, the AAUP and the four-year institutions generally are supporting the junior college movement.

There is going to be more development in the junior college area that in any other single area in education in the next twenty-five years. I state that without reservation. As a matter of fact, the University of Florida is already anticipating that within ten years between 70 and 75 per cent of all the freshmen and sophomores in this state will be trained at these junior colleges. Furthermore, the enrollment in terminal programs and adult education courses in junior colleges will probably exceed the enrollment in the college parallel program. This expansion will not be accomplished without controversy. For example, we are having a lot of useless and futile arguments about junior college education. Is it secondary education or is it higher education? Actually it is neither — it is junior college education. We have elementary education for the children of early childhood years. We have junior high school education for the pre-adolescent and the early adolescent. We have the senior high school education for the adolescent. We now have an emerging institution called junior college or community college education which provides learning opportunities for both young and old adults. These learning opportunities encompass the needs of those who plan to continue their education in four-year colleges and also the continuing education needs of those not interested in college degress. Therefore the junior college is not the tail of the four-year senior college kite. It is a kite in its own right.

We are accustomed to think of a state university such as the University of Florida with its twelve colleges and fourteen thousand students as a broad institution. When we look at the variety of offerings of the University, it does seem to be a comprehensive institution. However, in one sense of the word, the program of the University of Florida is not as broad as that of a well developed junior college. For example, the junior college is designed to provide for the educational needs of young adults with a wide range in academic ability and it provides continuing education for adults throughout their lives. On the other hand, the University selects its students from the upper ability levels and has but little concern with their continued education after they obtain their degrees.

What kind of organizational structure is needed for our rapidly developing junior colleges? We are concerned with two types of organizational structure — the external or legal organizational structure and the internal organization of the college.

Let us first examine the legal structure of junior colleges. The legal structure of a junior college is the external system created for its government and control as distinguished from the management provided by the president and his faculty. The legal structure differs for private and public institutions. Furthermore, private institutions differ from each other in legal structure and so do publicly supported institutions. Despite these differences, practically all junior colleges both public and private operate under some type of board. This legal pattern at once raises the question — what types of decisions should be made by the board and what types of decisions should be made by the president and his faculty? In publicly supported junior colleges, the decision making power is further distributed when a state agency is created with power over the junior colleges. Under that type of legal structure, there is decision-making power at the state level, at the local board level and at the institutional level. How can an institution define and achieve its purposes and objectives when decisions are made at three levels of authority? Obviously this cannot be done unless agreement has been reached on what types of decisions are to be made at each level of authority. Much conflict and confusion has arisen in the administration of junior colleges when the decision making power has not been properly allocated between these three levels of authority. How can we determine what decisions should be made at the state level; what at the local board level, and what by the president and his faculty? We don't know all the answers to this problem but we have some general guides that we might use.

I suggest the following as a basis for locating decision making power: (1) There is no inherent right to make decisions at the state level; there is no inherent right to make decisions at the local board level; nor is there any inherent right for the president and his faculty to make decisions at that level. (2) The place that we locate the decision-making power on a particular matter should be at that point where that decision can be most efficiently made to achieve the purpose of that institution. If that decision can be made more appropriately by the president and his faculty that is where the decision should be made. If it can be made more appropriately to achieve the purposes of that institution by the local board for that junior college there is where it should be made. If that decision can be more appropriately made at the state level for achieving the purposes of that institution then there is where that decision should be made.

There is another basis for determining decision-making power which is worthy of consideration. There are two basic types of decisions. One is decisions with respect to basic programs and policies and the other is executive decision making within the limits of established programs and policies. Decisions on basic policies and programs should be made by the governing board of the institution after giving full consideration to the recommendations of the president and the faculty. Executive decision making should be made as near the scene of action as possible within the limits of established policies and programs. That is, once you have defined your programs and policies, then the decision should be made as near the scene of action as possible. This would mean that very few if any of the executive decisions with respect to a specific junior college would be from the state level. In fact, very few would be made at the board level. Therefore executive decisions within the limits of established policies and programs should be made at the junior college level by the president and his faculty. This would also mean, applying the same criteria, that the president would not sit in his office and make all the decisions. Many of those executive decisions within the limits of established programs and policies would be made as near the scene of action as possible. For instance, we have here at the University a great and complicated organization with a thousand faculty members, a president and vice-president, a graduate dean, an academic dean and other central officers. Nevertheless the real operating unit of the University is the department. We have twelve colleges and most of these colleges are comprised of a number of operating departments. Therefore the executive decision making on many matters is delegated by the president to the colleges, and the deans of the colleges in turn delegate much decision making to the departments. This makes it possible to locate the decision making on many matters close to the scene of action.

I have already stated that the decisions on basic policies and programs should be made by the controlling board after considering the recommendations of the president and his faculty. But there are many non-major policies and details with respect to program development which are determined by the president and his faculty without going to the baord for approval. Each institution should therefore set up appropriate representative committees to study these matters and to make recommendations to the faculty. Many presidents have found it desirable to give the faculty the power to make final decisions on many policies and programs not determined by the board. However, executive decisions within the limits of established policies and programs should be made through the line organization at appropriate levels.

Should the legal control of public junior colleges be vested in a state board or should they be controlled by local boards of some type? The junior college movement is the first and only educational movement in the twentieth century which has been in the direction of de-centralization. This has no doubt contributed to their popularity. We have consolidated thousands of small schools and we have placed far more authority in state departments of education than obtained forty years ago. The public has gone along with this centralization movement grudgingly simply because it has resulted in a more efficient use of the educational dollar.

Many of our senior colleges, especially our state universities, have already grown too large for maximum efficiency and unless some de-centralization is provided, they will more than double their present size by 1970. Furthermore, the senior colleges have traditionally ignored adult education and non-degree technical programs. The junior college movement is therefore a decentralization plan which results in a broader educational program for more people at a lower per capita cost. It is the only movement in American education in this century where decentralization has resulted in greater financial efficiency and broader educational programs than centralization. If we want to continue to capitalize on the present popularity of this decentralization movement and our belief in local self government and our desire to have local decision making in so far as it is compatible with efficiency, then we had better keep these public junior colleges local institutions. There have been movements in certain quarters to try to take the decision making power on junior colleges entirely out of the hands of local boards. If we centralize the control of junior colleges so that there is no local participation in decision making, the junior colleges will almost certainly lose some much needed support.

Despite the advantages of administering junior colleges as local institutions, this plan involves some problems. For example, we have no type of local school district that is ideally suited to provide a junior college in all situations. The largest administrative district which we use to provide for the public schools is the county unit or a large city unit. A large and populous county unit or a large city school system is an appropriate unit for a junior college. We need for minimum acceptable efficiency a population of at least 50,000 or more in a junior college district. But most of the counties of the South have a population of far less than 5,000. In states not organized on the county unit basis, the situation is far more complicated. Therefore it appears that one solution to this problem in the sparsely settled areas is to superimpose a junior college district on top of a number of districts for grades 1-12. What kind of board should we create for this type of district? Should it be comprised of representatives from the boards of the constituent districts or should it be an entirely new board for the junior college district? We don't know the answer to this problem at the present time. However, if a district is large enough to support a junior college, experience has shown that the same board can successfully serve as the governing board for the junior college as well as grades 1-12. But if the board of education also governs the junior college, should an advisory board be established for the junior college and how advisory should it be? We don't know the answers to all of these questions and I suggest you might study these problems. I am not sure that the solution that would be appropriate in one state would be the solution that would be appropriate in another. But we must get some sort of a board which will permit local, lay people to participate in decision making on junior colleges, if we keep them local institutions.

Let us now look at the internal organizational structure needed for a junior college. The organizational structure of an institution is created to divide the labor and to coordinate the work of the institution.

Organizational structure is absolutely necessary in a human society where any group of people work together. There are some people who think that in a democracy we should minimize organizational structure. They insist that the less we have of structure, the more democracy we have. These people seem to confuse democracy with anarchy. Actually no human society under any form of government has ever accomplished anything worthwhile without organization. Organization means government. Organization means coordinating the efforts of individuals to achieve a purpose, and that is the key. The kind of organization that you should have in any junior college depends upon the purposes you are trying to achieve and you organize to achieve these purposes. Purposes will not and cannot be achieved without planning and organization.

It would be very nice this morning if I could present to you some type of an idealistic organizational structure which would fit all situations. It would be absolutely impossible for me to do that because many of you people are serving different educational institutions which have different purposes. Some of you serve sectarian institutions which have as one of their major purposes the teaching of sectarian education, that is, restricted to a specific denomination. Others may be inter-denominational. Some of you may have as your purpose a two-year college preparatory program, and do not have as a purpose adult education or terminal technial education. Some of you represent institutions that have many purposes. We have limited purpose junior colleges and broad purpose junior colleges. Both types of institutions are legitimate. The way you organize an institution depends upon its purpose, and each instutition must define its purposes before devising its organizational plan.

Once we have defined the purposes of an institution, we can apply some fairly well accepted principles of organization in developing an organizational plan. Those principles apply to both public colleges and private colleges. One of the most important of these principles is that each institution should have a single executive head. Conflict and inefficient administration almost invariably are outcomes of dual administration. By dual administartion I mean an executive head of a junior college, usually called the president, should have the authority to make top level executive decisions within the limits of established programs and policies. You will note that I have used the words "top-level" executive decisions because in a large institution all executive decisions should be made either by the president or someone responsible to him.

As I have already stated, not all decisions with respect to policy and program are made by the controlling board. A considerable area of decision making with respect to formulating policy and program is allocated by most institutions to the president and his faculty. These decisions are not executive decisions and therefore should not be made exclusively by executives in the line organization. A structure is needed within each institution to formulate policies and programs and another structure is needed to carry them out. The structure for formulating policies and programs is usually comprised of a series of representative committees which make recommendations to the total faculty for acceptance or rejection. The structure for carrying out policies and programs is usually a line organization. The faculty should have the opportunity to participate in many areas of policy and program formulation. Furthermore, provision should be made for student participation in decision making with respect to student activity policies and programs.

If the president sits in his office and makes all decisions with respect to institutional policies and programs, neither the faculty nor the students will make a maximum effort to implement them. People understand better and are more loyal to policies and programs which they have helped to develop. Participation of the faculty in decision making occurs only when a structure is provided for it. If I were to diagram that structure, I would place the faculty in a block at the top and various ad hoc and standing committees in blocks under the faculty. The executive decision making structure would of course be the line organization with the president at the top. However I want to repeat, the line organization is for the purpose of carrying out programs and policies which have been formulated by democratic processes and it is not for the purpose of formulating policies and programs.

You will note that I have emphasized the use of faculty committees in formulating programs and policies for the approval of the faculty. The committee method is the best method we know for developing programs and policies. But the committee method is the worst method we know for administering policies and programs. A line organization with responsibility and authority definitely delegated to individuals is necessary for efficient administration of programs and policies.

Some people in their emphasis on democratic administration have thought that the line and staff structure is out of date. That is ridiculous. We need a line and staff structure in any organization in order to carry out policies and programs. The error that has been made in the past is in using the line and staff structure to develop policies and programs as well as to carry them out. We still need this line and staff structure to execute policies and programs but not to develop them in isolation from the faculty.

Everyone needs a place in the line and staff organization and also in the policy and program forming organization. Everyone needs to know in the line and staff organization to whom and for what he is responsible. This may sound authoritarian but it is only common sense. Democracy has to do with participation in developing programs and policies and determining the directions in which we go. The line and staff organization is a definite delegated plan by which we implement policies and programs which have been democratically developed.

Another principle of internal organization is that each person should be administratively responsible to only one other person. If we make a person administratively responsible to two or more people he is likely to be frustrated by conflicting orders. Conflict in an organization results in lowered morale and reduced production. Each person likes to know to whom he is responsible and for what he is responsible.

Every organization needs unity of purpose and unity of purpose is best achieved through the process I have just described of setting up a structure so that the faculty can participate in program making and in policy making and a line and staff structure for doing the job.

A line and staff organization for carrying out policies and programs required a division of work. You have to divide the work before you can set up your organization. That is a very old principle. Adam Smith in his "The Wealth of Nations" written in 1776 first presented this principle. He studied the making of pins and found that a group of people working together, some cutting the wire, some shaping the head, some attaching the head, and some sharpening the pin could make far more pins per person than an equal number of people working under a plan by which each person made the entire pin. This same principle is applicable to educational work. If everybody tries to do everything, not very much work gets done. We have to determine what are our educational tasks and divide those tasks into homogenous divisions of work. The size of the job and the complications of the enterprise will determine how many divisions we need. For example, a large junior college will have a day school program, a night school program, an off-campus extension program, a college parallel program, a technical program, an adult education program, a food service program, a student guidance program, a student housing or transportation program, school plant service, business administration services, registration services, placement services and other programs and services. Obviously the president cannot personally direct and supervise all of these programs and services. One person can supervise only a limited number of people. We don't know exactly what that number is. It varies with different types of enterprises but we know the more complicated the enterprise, the more complicated the job, the smaller the number of people one person can directly supervise. For example, if the task is a responsible and complicated task, one person may be able to supervise only about eight to ten persons but if the task is a simple one, an executive may direct the work of thirty to forty persons.

But when we divide the work, provision must be made for coordinating the efforts of all the subdivisions of the institution. That is the primary responsibility of the president. However, if he has worked with his governing board and his faculty in developing well conceived policies and programs consistent with the purposes of the institution and if he has developed a well conceived internal organizational structure for the institution, his task will be made immeasurably easier.

Finally, the president must learn to delegate authority and responsibility. The president who believes that "if you want a thing done well, you must do it yourself" will never be an executive. It is useless for a president to set up an organization and then fail to use that organization to carry out programs and policies. If a president is not capable of developing and using an organizational structure to achieve the purposes of an institution, he is not capable of being president.

In conclusion, our junior colleges are growing more rapidly than any other area of our educational system. These institutions are becoming larger and more numerous. Therefore it is imperative that we develop organizational structures which will facilitate the attainment of the purposes of these institutions. Each institution needs an external legal organizational structure and an internal organizational structure. Each of these organizational structures must provide for decision making with respect to the formulation of programs and policies and for decision making with respect to the executive of programs and policies. Whether an institution achieves its purposes will be determined to a considerable extent by the wisdom we use in creating organizational structures.

STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK: ITS PLACE IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

by Dr. Melvene Draheim Hardee
Professor of Higher Education
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

In a group like this composed largely of "the lords of creation," i.e., the male of the species, I am ever mindful of the sharp observation of Philosopher Schopenhauer:

"Woman is a creature with long hair and short ideas."

Fortunately times and fashions have changed. Now, with short hair, we women can manifest some longer ideas. At any rate, I am about to discuss an idea too long to confine to an hour for it encompasses the college lifetime of your students -- two years, in this instance. In the necessary condensation of my discussion, I will hopefully do these things:

1. Narrate some selected capsule cases of students
2. Discuss the aims of higher education with particular reference to the aims of the junior college
3. Relate the aims of student personnel work to the purpose of the junior college
4. Cite some persisting problems concerning student personnel work with which we must continue to grapple

1. Student Cases

When I was editing the volume, Counseling and Guidance in General Education, I requested a good many knowledgeable persons in the junior college to contribute chapters or other sections to the book. Represented are teachers and student personnel workers from the Boston University Junior College, Stephens College, Shimer College, Orange Coast College, and General College of the University of Minnesota to name several. As often as possible, I requested that these contributors give illustrations of student need and show the practices of student personnel workers as they moved to effect change in students. (I am speaking of behavioral change resulting from student personnel work in the same manner as one would speak of change in behavior resulting from a classroom experience.)

Among the provocative case studies contributed by the various writers were several which have point and purpose in our discussion today. I shall refer to these cases with the same designations as are used in the book:[1]

1. The Case of William

William entered the college with no idea of what he wanted to be, but with the hope that college would prepare him for something. He had never liked nor done well in school, but he naively expected college to be different. His father did not believe in college education and gave him nothing but the grudging permission to enter college, providing he would pay for it himself. Resentfully, but doggedly, Bill earned enough money for the first quarter.

Each of Bill's troubles is common to a goodly number of freshmen. Any one of them can interfere with a student's success. The combination of all of them in one person can easily result in complete failure. Two things prevented catastrophe for Bill. He himself sought help early in the year. The help he needed was there, in the counseling office. Bill came to the office for aid in finding a part-time job. In the first interview all his troubles came to light and he and the counselor together planned a line of attack.

Through a referral to the student employment office, Bill located a job demanding only a reasonable number of hours per week and bringing in enough money to see him through the first year. In a series of talks with the couselor, Bill discovered what was wrong with his study habits and what to do about improving them. He learned how to budget his time, making ample provision for work, study and recreation. The counselor explained to Bill the meaning of the aptitude and the interest tests he had taken as an entering freshman, and helped him plan for the first year a frankly exploratory program of widely varied courses. As he began to know himself better and to experience particular success in mathematics, Bill arranged for further tryouts in accounting and economics. By the middle of the second year, his problem of vocational choice was happily solved by the decision to become an accountant and by a transfer to the prebusiness program of the arts college.

Equally important. . . was Bill's discovery that learning itself was fun; that all sorts of courses, not only those related to his job, gave him great satisfaction. His improved grades earned him a scholarhips for his junior year, and, finally, Bill's father became so proud of his son's achievements that he agreed to finance the senior year.

---

[1] See Counseling and Guidance in General Education, edited by M. D. Hardee, World Book Company, New York, 1955.

Bill's story could not have had a happy ending without the boy's own awareness of his need for help and his willingness to work on his own problems. But neither could it have occurred except in a two year college -- committed to a policy of giving a chance to every applicant for admission, and staffed not only with instructors who believe in the dignity and worth of every individual student but also with counselors who have both the time and the special training to work with any student, whatever his needs.

Interlude (to distribute papers)[2]

To give us some grounding for this case and the several to follow, could we do some scanning of the sheet titled, "Basic Elements of Student Personnel Work" which I am distributing. These may be said to be the indispensable elements of a student personnel program. You will note that in several instances, at least, the item does not apply to the public junior college as generally understood -- i. e., see the item on residence hall counseling and on religious counseling as it refers to the chaplain's role.

In the instance of Bill, as narrated, his initial problem took him to the employment office (see #9 on the sheet). He thereafter, spent time in the study skills clinic, working on study habits and time budgeting. (Item 13) His progress was hastened by special individual testing (Item 12). With his counselor he was able to effect a more suitable program of coursework (Item 4), see both educational and vocational counseling, the counseling process eventuating in Bill's shift of major. There are at least five aspects of the program of organized student personnel services from which Bill benefited. I would at this point ask two questions: (1) Was this educational assistance effected solely by two persons, by Bill and his counselor? (2) How much in dollars and cents was this assistance worth?

2. The Case of S.M.

S. M. was an average-sized, 19-year-old boy with a bright red beard. He was, in addition, argumentative and belligerent. Becuase of his excitability, peculiar appearance (mostly due to his beard), and enthusiasm for guns and knives, there was some question as to whether he might be psychotic and dangerous. His counselor at the at the junior college referred him to the school psychologist. The latter's report, after interviewing and testing, stated: "The IQ is 115; immature personality, childish, extremely passive nature, play-acting, enjoys trying to scare others and acting mysterious. Beard is symbolic of his need to be masculine and to assert himself."

Recommendations made by the psychologist to the counselor were: (1) reassure instructors of S.M.'s harmlessness, (2) help instructors to understand the underlying needs which bring about this undesirable behavior pattern, (3) do not urge him to remove beard, and (4) encourage instructors to accept him and give him recognition.

The instructors cooperated in the plan, accepting and recognizing him S.M. was given a job in the school library and praised for his dependability when he proved to be a reliable worker. He was invited to take part in swimming activities along with the team, although it was impossible to schedule a swimming class for him in the regular physical education activity. He was advised to enroll in the remedial reading class, where be became intrigued with improving his reading speed. He deserved and received recognition for his outstanding progress in this subject. His first academic success came in mathematics, where his instructor was enthusiastic in praising his achievement.

Remarkable change has been discerned in S.M.'s attitude. He admits he likes "parts of school" and expresses his intention of "showing up" those who discouraged an academic career for him. Most significant of all is the disappearance of the beard, which he removed in three stages: first the sideburns, then the front portion over the chin, and finally the goatee.

* * * * * * * *

With the aid of the check list again, could we track S.M. in the student personnel program of his junior college. He first checked with his counselor (see Item 4). He was referred to the clinical psychologist (see Item 13). He, too, was given placement help. (Item #9) He was encouraged to participate in student activities (Item #7). He enrolled in remedial reading work

---

[2] (See elements of student personnel work from D. D. Feder and others, "Organization and Administration of Student Personnel Work, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.)

(Item #13). He, too, was tested in this process of being counseled (Item 12).

The questions I would propose here: (1) How was the good cooperation between instructional personnel and student personnel workers effected? (2) How much in dollars and cents was this assistance worth? As much as -- or more than Bill's in the previous study? On what do you base your judgment?

3. The Case of L. O.

To illustrate the fact that the student personnel services are as effective with women students, may we cite the case of L. O., a gifted girl. She scored on the ACE at the ninty-fifth percentile. Her grades in mathematics in high school were unusually high, with the result she enrolled as a science major in college. At the time of her referral to a counselor, L. O. expressed a lack of interest in college work. She admitted that she had cut classes over a period of two weeks and that she didn't know why she was in college.

As the student and counselor talked, L. O. revealed that her mother and father had been divorced since she was six years old and that she had lived with both parents alternately, having been enrolled in thirteen different high schools in a four-year period. Between high school and college she had worked one year as a salesgirl, with moderate success. L. O. indicated that "she didn't seem to belong to anyone," and that this feeling of estrangement to people perhaps accounted for her failure to adjust to college work. As soon as steps were taken by the counselor to adjust the course load in order that L. O. make up the work missed over the two-weeks period of absence, the student began a series of conferences with the psychologist.

* * * * * * * * * * *

In an era of greatest consideration directed to the needs of the gifted student, we can trace L. O.'s progress from the counselor (Item 4) directly to the psychologist (Item 13). The questions which follow are these: (1) Is there reason to believe that instructional personnel and student personnel workers will need at some point to work together on L. O.'s college experiences? (2) What is L. O's rehabilitation worth in dollars and cents? More or less than Bill"s and S. M.'s?

2. The Goals of Higher Education in Contemporary America

There are a sizeable number of academic men and non-educators who are indifferent to and critical of the student personnel programming in American higher education. Some who are currently nibbling away -- like termites in the education edifice -- contend that student personnel services are "eroding" the budget, taking from instruction much needed monies. Another group of critics are burrowing under the edifice like gophers, contending that student personnel services are forms of "welfare statism" -- doles and hand-outs which render the student incapable of making a decision or acting on his own. These critics call attention to the fact that America was once -- and should be increasingly -- ruggedly individualistic!

Anyone with even half an understanding of the history of higher education will acknowledge that the undergraduate in the colonial and federal periods was hardly a Beowulf -- or a Jack the Giant Killer. In the charter of the University of Pennsylvania bearing the date of 1749 there appeared a directive to establish. . .

> a nursery of virtue and wideom. . . that will produce men of dispositions and capacities beneficial to mankind in the various occupations of life suited to the infant state of North America.

The reference to nursery of virtue and wisdom shows reasonable solicitude for the welfare of youth of this "infant state."

At this same institution, the trustees were bade. . . .

> . . to make it their pleasure and business to visit the academy often, to encourage and countenance the youth, countenance and assist the masters and by all means in their power, advance the usefulness and reputation of the design; that they will look on the students in some measure as their own children, treating them with familiarity and affection.

We are struck by expressed benevolence, the paternalism evidenced between board member and student -- the use of the words "familiarity" and "affection."

More than two centuries later, concern for the individual continues to be expressed by educators. In his valedictory remarks, Arthur Adams, the retiring president of the American Council on Education, Affirmed:

> We interpret education rightly through our concern for the individual and what happens to him or to her. Does he have aptitude for what he is studying? Have we quickened his sense of initiative? Have we thought about his problems, how he looks at things? Have we imposed artificial administrative barriers in the way of the accomplishment of his ambition? In short, have we cared about him?

In a day of frenzied racing for space in college, and some attendant jostling and pushing to remain in place once admitted, this emphasis upon "caring about a student" shines like a beacon. This light was struck in the 18th century. Its need is for trimming--not dimming.

What are the aims of higher education? What are we reminded in the signal publication, GOALS FOR AMERICANS, that we should be accomplishing? The purposes of higher education in America spring from the dream of individual opportunity. The provision extended to American youth for development of their intellectual, aesthetic, vocational and social maturity is of fundamental import, but it is through achievement of individual and group competence that solutions will be found for problems of a democratic society and the means for achieving beneficial and enduring social ends.

The intent of American higher education--and I believe most specifically the junior college--is to develop the individual's creative imagination in order that he be able to apply trained intelligence to the administration of public affairs, social invention, scientific technology, and international understanding. (And if you wonder where the education of women fits here, I should say that these short-haired damsels with their lengthening ideas fit at all points in the continuum, most particularly in the area of social invention which I conceive to include the home and the school and the community as social enterprises.)

From what appears to me to be a memorable conference held last December in Berkeley, California, there has emerged a bulletin. FOCUS ON THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE. The only fault I have to find with it is that the conference was long on men. I find only one woman (Mrs. Alice Leopold of the U.S. Department of Labor) numbered among 33 men. This does not represent the more favorable ratio of women to men in institutions of higher education...nor in life outside the academic community!

At any rate, in this publication, p. 5, there is asked a basic question: "What is the two year college's distinctive role?" Thereafter, there are asked questions of interest: "What types of student personnel services are most needed in two-year colleges and how should they be organized (1) to facilitate the distribution of students among programs and (2) assist in the maximum development of the student through experiences outside the classroom? (pp. 6-7) Finally, (p. 7), there appear the twin questions: What type of general education program produces the greatest personal development in students? How may counseling and guidance services be most effectively perceived and administered?

3. The Aims of Student Personnel Work and Those of the Junior College

The answer to the first question: "What is the two year college's distinctive role?" cannot be reached without first, a careful study of the purposes of higher education, of which only a fleeting glimpse was given today. Instructional personnel and student personnel workers need to consider in combination the what they contribute to the institution's objectives. Take for example this statement of institutional purposes as set forth in the catalog of a junior college of this state:

> __________Junior College recognizes that the essential elements of the American way of life are the sanctity of every personality and the right of every individual to develop his moral, intellectual, spiritual, and physical capacities to the maximum of his ability...It is the function of this junior college to nurture, train and encourage its students for the leadership essential to the continuation of our democracy.

There is not contesting the excellence of this aim. And, pursuing the question raised by the conferees in the California meeting of last December, how does the junior college fulfill this aim in a manner distinctively different from that of the four year institution, the professional or technical institution, the business school?

View, if you will, the climate of learning on your campus with a microscopic eye, and answer truthfully: "What are the components which have been fused to effect a climate of learning from which students will emerge with noticeable improvement in their moral, intellectual, spiritual and physical capacities?" As you name the components.. (1) administrative foresight, (2) faculty competence, (3) comprehensive curriculum, (4) top-quality facilities--classroom and laboratory, (5) adequate budgetary resource----stop NOT short of naming (6) comprehensive student personnel program. This is the kind of program suggested in the handout sheets, the one from which Bill, S. M., L. O. and other students like them were helped in developing moral, intellectual, spiritual and physical competence.

Any institutional survey, designed and implemented, must take into account the program of student personnel services, not as an after-thought which is too often the case (like surveying the grand halls and ballrooms and then in the last minutes noting, "And, let's go down in the coal bin now and see what's lying around there.") If student personnel work is a conglomerate mess of odds and ends, swept out of other academic chambers, (a) it will be just coal-bin business; (b) it will be manned eventually by persons not eligible for academic positions (educational roustabouts); and (c) it will be minimally supported by the leavings from the more affluent academic budgets. This is the bleak future that exists for student personnel work unless........

4. What are the Unless-es ?

By way of lead-in, I should say student personnel work is on the brink of becoming a full-blown profession. We say this in a volume which appeared about two years ago.[3] The criteria we are moving to meet are these:

1. Application of standards of selection and training
2. Definition of job titles and functions
3. Possession of a body of specialized knowledge and skills
4. Development of a professional consciousness and of professional groups
5. Self-imposition of standards of admission and performance
6. Legal recognition of the vocation
7. Development of a code of ethics
8. Performance of a socially needed function

One ponders these criteria with the question, "And how far along have you come on each?" Take them in reverse: (No. 8) Surely student personnel work performs a socially needed function if the brief case studies of even three students is proof. Certainly, the development of moral, intellectual, spiritual, and physical competence to maintain a free society is the focus. (No. 7) A code of ethics has just been completed by the personnel work, it having been adopted in the Denver meeting of the association in April. (No. 6) Legal recognition of the vocation is not uniform yet. An important test case--several in fact--have brought encouraging judgments, chiefly, in the affirmation that student personnel work is a part of the educational process--and this is what we have always wanted it to be; not a therapeutic process exclusive of the academic enterprise. (No. 5) As a group, student personnel workers are most vulnerable on the score of setting their own selective admissions and retention of personnel. (No. 4) The professional personnel groups are becoming increasingly well recognized, even to international affiliation at the present time. There are more than 12,000 members of the student personnel association, and the headquarters office is in Washington, D.C. (No. 3) A specialized body of knowledge and skills is now visible--this compounded of scientific and humanistic studies. Separate coursework includes anthropology, sociology, psychology, educational measurement, evaluation, other behavioral sciences, management, arts. (No. 2) Job titles and functions were submitted as early as 1951, with refinement proceeding since then. (No. 1) The final point, application of standards of selection and training is a state of flux. No one at the moment can affirm positively just what training a student personnel worker should have nor what attitudes, aptitudes, personality traits he should possess. (I have my own ideas as a student personnel trainer, but I am quite sure they are compounded of my own experience as a practitioner. These need to be confirmed by new crops of students.)

Coursework in this major was available more than thirty years ago. (This is not to say I took my courses that long ago!) I took my first course in student "deaning" as an undergraduate in college the mid-thirties. There have been strong majors in this field at Columbia University, University of Chicago, University of Minnesota, to name only three for years before this time. Student personnel work is no Johnny-come-lately to the education scene. Its lateness lies in the acceptance of its worth by academicians who seem not to be conscious of its existence and aware of its potential.

And now for the unlesses ——

I would predict that student personnel work would never get above ground (remain in its coal bin, cast-off state) unless. . .

1. Unless the relevance of student personnel work and general education is made crystal clear. I assume that general education is that education which attempts to develop in students the skills, understandings, attitudes and values which equip him for broad and responsible participation in a democratic society. Can classroom instruction do all this ? At what point does the instructional area merge with student personnel work in effecting good general education ?

---

[3] (See Student Personnel Services in Education, p. 194, University of Chicago Press, 1958)

2. Unless the relevance of student personnel work and professional education is explored. I adjudge professional education to be that concerned with the theoretical or practical aspects of special fields, these requiring extensive educational or practical experience for dispatching complicated assignments. What is the product of professional education? What is this student image which emerges from technical programs in electronics, nursing, business education, or other?

> (As Tead in The Climate of Learning contends, " If those responsible for shaping the content of college education do not know what they want to see learned, and what personal qualities they expect the growth process to include, and what kind of adults, with what kind of competences they would like to be able to point to with pride in their alumni, they will never get far in organizing a unified program to assure genuine learning.)

How is this professional product effected? In company with what student personnel services?

3. Unless the institutional budget is not so conceived as to provide a fair share of money for the operation of student personnel programs. Student personnel workers are pressed to put a dollar value on their accomplishments. This is the reason for my earlier questions about the value of aid to Bill and the other two students whoses cases were cited. Some means must be found for equating the learning that comes from counseling with that which derives from classroom teaching. An examination of budgets for junior college personnel workers is underway in the U. S. Office of Education, and I submit we should apprise ourselves of these findings.

4. Unless the relationship of student personnel workers to (a) the administration and (b) the faculty is clarified. Student personnel workers have, as Ed Glanz of Boston points out in a well-constructed article in the Junior College Journal last year, aligned themselves with administrators (their presidents and deans) to the exclusion of cooperation with teaching faculty. While presidents and deans can admittedly use some expert help in their dispatch of duty, theirs is not the exclusive ear into which the student personnel worker pours his wisdom. The potential that the student personnel worker has for assisting members of the teaching faculty must not go unused.

5. Unless the faculty member joins at an appropriate level with the student personnel worker in fulfilling the aims earlier expressed in the catalogs and brochures of our colleges. I have specific reference to the need for faculty members to serve in the program of faculty advising, fulfilling their traditional role as mentors as well as providing academic assistance within an organized program. Right now, I see some abdication of responsibility for faculty advising and some twisting and wrenching to pull faculty advising out of the student personnel program and to place it in the academic area.[4]

6. Unless student personnel workers do a better job of communicating what it is they do. Student personnel work is as much in danger of mis-overstanding as mis-understanding. There are some things that student personnel workers cannot do along with the plenty that they can do and must demonstrate! Their students well served are their best communicators. How can they and students present the facts?

7. Finally, unless student personnel benefits are extended to all students in the junior college in the amount and kind needed by day students, extended day or evening division students, and by persons in the adult program. This need is obvious in the current unmet requests for help, in the backlog of "cases", and the work overload of practitioners.

As you see, our concerns are many and this had led me to suggest the formulation of a Commission for the Study of Student Personnel Work in the Junior College as a part of a larger study in the American College Personnel Association in which I am an officer. This Commission held its first meeting on June 27 in Tacoma Park, Maryland, and the Chairman of this Commission is among us. She recalled to me in Washington a couple of months ago that both of us were "bellowing" (as only women can) for more attention to be paid junior college student personnel work as far back as 1950 and 1951 when another professional group was organized, the Southern College Personnel Workers. I am positive that Sadie Higgins' leadership in the Commission on the Study of Junior College Student Personnel Work will bring benefits. One result of this study commission will appear in the program presented in 1963 in our national Boston program. This is the era of the great boom in junior college student personnel work. That we have lived long enough to see it happen (ten years later) is cause for our rejoicing.

---

[4] (See Melvene D. Hardee, The Faculty in College Counseling, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.)

Summary

In this discourse, I have hastened through four aspects of current consideration:

(1) narrating some selected capsule cases of students
(2) discussing the aims of higher education with particular reference to the aims of the junior college
(3) relating the aims of student personnel work to the purposes of the junior college
(4) citing some persisting problems with which we must continue to grapple.

I admonish my students that the junior college movement is the most vital in American higher education today. May I admonish you that your own institutional program will be as vital as is *your interest* in the student and *your means* for expressing this interest in a program of organized student personnel services?

NEGLECTED OPPORTUNITIES IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Dr. B. Lamar Johnson
Professor of Higher Education
University of California, Los Angeles

When I was invited to address the Institute this forenoon, I was given a list of eight topics classified under the heading "Program and Services" from which it was suggested that I select two. I might have chosen any of them, for they are all important and of interest and concern to you and to me. Two appear, however, to merit particular consideration — for they represent largely neglected opportunities in the junior colleges of America.

I have, therefore, elected to address you this forenoon on the subject, "Neglected Opportunities in the Junior College" — and to discuss two opportunities which, if capitalized on, can dynamically vitalize our educational programs. I refer to: institutional research in the junior college and to the junior college library.

A. Institutional Research in the Junior College.

Brumbaugh really defines institutional research in the title of a monograph he has written on the subject: Research Designed to Improve Institutions of Higher Learning.[1]

In a recent survey of institutional research in Western junior colleges, I defined the term as referring to "studies made on your campus which are designed to improve your college or any part of its program. . . ."

In a recent article in the Junior College Journal, Strickler gives his concept of institutional research as:

> "research which is directed toward providing data useful or necessary in the making of intelligent administrative decisions and/or for the successful maintenance, operation, and/or improvement of a given institution of higher education. It includes the collection and analysis of data used in appraising the environment or setting in which the institution operates, in preparing the budget in planning new buildings, in assigning space in existing buildings, in determining faculty loads, in admitting students, in individualizing insturction, in planning the educational program, and the like. It is needed to facilitate efficient operation, but it is also needed to promote qualitative improvements.[2]

Business and industry rely heavily upon research — not only in the development, design, and marketing of new products, but also in the field of managerial operation. Industry uses research because it pays; it increases efficiency; it contributes to profits. Education — particularly colleges and universities — is increasingly recognizing the value of institutional studies.

During the past three years the Office of Statistical Information and Research of the American Council on Education has periodically published its "Report on Current Institutional Research." In the eighteen issues which have been published to date (Number 1, May 12, 1958 to Number 18, January 24, 1961) materials have been included from thirty-four colleges and universities. Only one of these, Stephens College, is a junior college.

Junior colleges do, of course, conduct institutional studies. Fifty-five two-year colleges participated in Sprague's 1959 survey of institutional research in the West — and forty-four of these reported studies they had made.[3]

In his recent study of institutional research in Los Angeles Junior Colleges, Swanson identified 198 different studies — and he points out that his list of investigations is by no means complete.[4]

This forenoon I shall report selected findings from a survey of institutional research in one hundred junior colleges in thirteen Western states. In April of this year, I addressed an inquiry to the Chief administrators of 124 junior colleges in thirteen Western States.[5] Questions were asked regarding how colleges are organized (including plans for the future) for conducting institutional research and regarding the nature of investigations that have been made.

---

[1] A. J. Brumbaugh. Research Designed to Improve Institutions of Higher Learning. American Council in Education, 1960.

[2] W. Hugh Stickler. "The Expanding Role of Institutional Research in American Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, 31: 542-548, May, 1961.

[3] Hall T. Sprague. Institutional Research in the West. The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1959.

[4] Herbert L. Swanson. "Survey of Institutional Research in the Los Angeles Junior Colleges." Unpublished manuscript. University of California, Los Angeles, 1961.

As will be noted in Table I, one hundred colleges (more than eighty per cent of those addressed) responded to the inquiry. Since the junior college in the West is predominantly tax supported, it is not surprising that 95 of these participating are public instituions. It will also be observed, however, that 85 per cent of the tax supported colleges responded as compared with replies from only 38 per cent of the independent institutions. The low percentage of response from these colleges is undoubtedly due largely to the fact that the thirteen private two-year colleges in the states included in the survey are small institutions. Their total enrollments range from 15 to 1998 — with a median of 123.[6]

The median enrollment of the one hundred colleges included in the survey is 1,320 — with a range from 94 to 22,849. Sixty-two are California institutions; seven are located in Washington and five in Wyoming. The remaining 26 colleges are in Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon and Utah.

TABLE I

JUNIOR COLLEGES INCLUDED IN SURVEY

Type of College	Number		Per Cent of Response
	Invited to Participate	Responding	
Public	111	95	85.6
Private	13	5	38.4
Total	124	100	80.7

A major purpose of the survey was to secure information about the administration and operation of the research program.

Types of organization. Data in Table II indicate that less than one-third (29 per cent) of the junior colleges are organized to coordinate research. Most of these (27 per cent) have part-time coordination, usually an individual, but in four colleges a committee. Two institutions report full-time coordination. One of these has an administrative dean for institutional research and the other a faculty committee whose chief responsibility is intitutional studies.

TABLE II

ORGANIZATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
IN 100 WESTERN JUNIOR COLLEGES

Type of Organization	Number	Per Cent
Full-time coordination	2	2
Part-time coordination	27	27
Decentralized organization	43	43
Little institutional research	28	28
Total	100	100

The median enrollment of colleges which provide coordination for institutional research is 2,130 and that for colleges with a decentralized type of organization is 2,373. In this survey there is no evidence that the size of a college is related to the practice of having a centralized or a decentralized plan. On the other hand, there is a tendency for smaller colleges to do less research — for the median enrollment of the colleges which report little research is only 591.

Use of consultants. Twenty-five colleges report using consultants in their programs of institutional research. Consultants are typically employed when expert assistance is needed on some particular study or development, such as making enrollment projections or planning curriculum revisions. Five colleges, however, have a continuing plan for using off-campus assistance. Four of these employ a single consultant over a period of years.

---

[5] The inquiry form was in part adapted from one used by W. Hugh Stickler. *Institutional Research Concerning Land-Grant Institutions and State Universities.* Office of Institutional Research and Service, Florida State University, 1959. Mimeographed. pp. 41-43.

[6] Enrollment data are from *Junior College Directory, 1961.* *American Association of Junior Colleges, 1961.*

Under such an arrangement a consultant visits a college several times (in one case monthly) during the year. One college reports having an annual visit by a committee of three consultants.

Seven institutions in unified districts report getting research assistance from "the central office," and four refer to aid from a state department of education.

Despite the relatively infrequent use of consultants a number of presidents express an interest in the use of such assistance. One observes, "Would like to — but have no funds for this." Another asserts, "We need some leadership from the outside."

Changes planned in programs of institutional research. In response to a question regarding changes planned in the organization of institutional research, twenty-three participants in the survey reported plans for improving their programs (See Table III). Particularly recognized (in a total of eleven replies) are plans for coordinating institutional research: appoint a part-time coordinator of institutional research, 6 colleges; appoint a full-time coordinator of institutional research, 1; establish a staff committee to coordinate institutional research, 1; and improve coordination of institutional research, 3.

Nine colleges intend to make more studies; two plan to provide additional released time for faculty members to work on studies; and a similar number to make increased use of consultants. Two presidents propose to formulate a policy and plan for institutional research — both of which are at present lacking.

Although comparatively few colleges report plans for change, such projections as are described should, if carried out, increase both the quantity and value of institutional studies.

TABLE III

PLANS FOR CHANGES IN PROGRAMS OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
REPORTED BY TWENTY-THREE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Changes	Frequency
Make more studies	9
Appoint a part-time coordinator of institutional research	6
Improve coordination of institutional research	3
Formulate a college policy and plan for institutional research	2
Make greater use of consultants	2
Provide additional release time for faculty members to work on institutional research	2
Establish a staff committee to coordinate institutional research	1
Provide additional funds for studies by faculty members	1

Assistance to staff members in studying problems relating to their work. The value of wide staff participation in institutional research is obvious. Stickler, for example, observes:

> Institutional research offices are not agencies unto themselves. Widespread staff participation in institutional research familiarizes the individual with the problems of the college or university, and prepares him to deal realistically and effectively with the research findings.[7]

One means of eliciting faculty participation in research is to provide staff members with assistance in studying problems which are of concern to them. In order to determine the extent to which such aid is given, participants in this survey were asked the following question:

> Does your college aid staff members who wish to study problems relating to their work (for example, provide technical assistance in planning and conducting research, clerical or secretarial help, released time for making studies)? If yes, please indicate the types of assistance provided?

Sixty-three colleges report providing varied types of assistance to staff members in studying problems related to their work (see Table IV). Most often available is secretarial or clerical help (thirty-nine colleges). Release time for research is, upon occasion, granted by twenty colleges and nineteen responses report that technical research assistance is available. The provision of materials needed in conducting research is referred to in ten responses and financial assistance is mentioned in eight. Special reference to the use of IBM equipment is made in two reports.

---

[7] Stickler *op. cit.*, p 548.

TABLE IV

TYPES OF ASSISTANCE SIXTY-THREE JUNIOR COLLEGES PROVIDE STAFF MEMBERS IN STUDYING PROBLEMS RELATING TO THEIR WORK

Type of Assistance	Frequency
Secretarial or clerical	39
Released Time	20
Technical	19
Materials	10
Financial	8
Use of IBM equipment	2

Files or research reports. If the results of research are to be used and if duplication of studies is to be avoided, it would seem to be important to have a central file of reports of research done at a college. Accordingly, this question was asked in the survey:

> Does your college maintain a central file of all reports of institutional research done on your campus? If yes, what is the name and title of the staff member responsible for these files?

Fifty colleges report having such files and forty-seven indicate that a single officer is responsible for them. At four colleges, however, responsibility for files of research is shared by two or three different staff members.

Table V indicates that the president keeps the files in thirteen colleges and the dean of instruction and the dean of student personnel (or a member of his staff) in eleven and nine colleges, respectively. Among them, these three major administrative officers keep and organize research reports in more than two-thirds of the colleges which maintain central files. Also designated as having this responsibility are the coordinator of institutional research in five colleges, the librarian in three, and the vice-president in two.

Several administrators made comments regarding filing reports of research. One president explained, "When I became president of ____________________ College four years ago, I asked to see the reports of institutional research studies which had been made during recent years. To my surprise, no files of reports were available; and no one really knew what had been done. You may be sure that we now have an up-to-date file."

In response to the question regarding the maintenance of central files of research, another administrator replied, "We should and soon will."

A third wrote, "Thanks for sending this inquiry! We do not have a central file but as a result of your inquiry will soon have one." This is one of the few occasions, I might note, on which I have been thanked for sending a questionnaire.

TABLE V

STAFF MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING FILES OF RESEARCH REPORTS

Staff Member	Frequency
President	13
Dean of Instruction	11
Dean of Student Personnel, or member of his staff	9
Coordinator of Instituitional Research	5
Librarian	3
Vice-President	2
Business Officer	1
Director of Educational Services	1
Director of Public Relations	1
Registrar	1
Not designated	8

Nature of institutional research studies. As an aid to determining the nature of institutional research in Western junior colleges participants in the survey were invited to list the titles of representative investigations made at their colleges during recent years. Reports of available studies were also requested. Sixty-nine respondents listed 330 titles and reports of 111 of these were supplied by twenty-five colleges.

The 111 reports were grouped on the basis of the subjects of investigations. Because of the difficulty of determining the nature of studies from their titles, no attempt was, however, made to classify those for which only titles were available. (See Table VI.)

TABLE VI

SUBJECTS INVESTIGATED IN INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH STUDIES AT FIFTY-FIVE WESTERN JUNIOR COLLEGES

Subject	Present Survey	Sprague	Swanson	Total	
	(25)	(44)	(6)	Number	Per Cent
Students	48	39	72	159	35.4
Curriculum	27	26	45	98	21.9
Enrollment	10	10	30	50	11.1
Faculty	6	27	10	43	9.6
Admission	6	4	20	30	6.7
Plant	4	16	8	28	6.2
Admistration and Organization of Institution	5	8	5	18	4.0
Relationships with Outside Agencies	2	1	7	10	2.2
Finance	3	4	0	7	1.6
Teaching	0	5	1	6	1.3
Total	111	140	198	449	100.0

Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of colleges included in each survey.

To supplement the findings of this survey, a tabulation was made (and included in Table VI) of the studies which Western junior colleges reported to Sprague in 1959.[8] Also included in Table VI is a frequency classification of studies identified by Swanson in this 1961 analysis of 198 reports of institutional research at Los Angeles junior colleges.[9]

It will be noted that these three surveys included 449 institutional studies in Western junior colleges.

Students. The largest number of studies in any category (a rank of first in each of the three surveys) are those relating to students; which comprise more than one-third (35.4 per cent) of the total reported. Representative of investigations of this type are "A Survey of the Academic Performance of First-Time Freshmen Students Who Ranked in the Lowest Quartile of their High School Graduating Classes" (Phoenix College); "Changing Nature of Students" (City College of San Francisco); and "Student Employment Survey" (Contra Costa College).

Curriculum. Curriculum studies rank second in frequency and account for more than one-fifth of those reported. Included in this category are "Electronic Computer Survey" (Orange Coast College); "A Survey of Two-Year Terminal-Occupational Offerings in the Junior Colleges of Wyoming" (Northwest Community College, Wyoming); "How Los Angeles City Schools are Meeting Responsibilities for Post-High School Vocational Education" (Division of Extension and Higher Education, Los Angeles City Schools); and "Physical Education Survey," (Fresno City College).

Enrollment. Eleven per cent of the studies relate to enrollment. From Sheridan College, Wyoming, comes an enrollment study and Los Angeles Valley College reports a series of comparative enrollment surveys. No study of enrollment projections was submitted for use in the present survey. One the countrary, Sprague (who included senior colleges and universities as well as two-year colleges) found that enrollment studies were "for the most part, studies of trends, estimates, and projections."[10] Six studies of junior college enrollment projections were reported to Sprague.

---

[8] Hall T. Sprague op. cit. pp. 29-68.
[9] Herbert L. Swanson, op. cit. p. 27.

Faculty. Less than ten per cent of studies included in the three surveys deal with the faculty and only six of the 111 in the present survey may be so classified. These include a study of teaching load at Los Angeles Harbor College and one on "Salary Criteria for Vocational Instructors in Selected California Junior Colleges" made at El Camino College.

Admission. Almost seven per cent of reports are concerned with admission. In this area East Los Angeles College makes a continuing analysis of applications for admission as an aid to forecasting areas of enrollment and staff requirements. Fullerton College reports a study of applicants for admission who failed to register and also a survey of items of information California junior colleges obtain regarding entering students.

Plant. Studies of plant (comprising 6.2 per cent of those surveyed) include some concerned with plans for future buildings and others which deal with the utilization of currently available space. Representative of studies of the former type is one reported by Ricks College: "Physical Science Building Program Requirements for 3,000 Students." Los Angeles Harbor College reports a five-year survey of room utilization.

Organization and Administration of Institution. Relatively few studies of the organization and administration of institutions are reported. Pueblo Junior College reports an organizational projection of a self-study, and Olympic College a study of aims and objectives.

Relationships with Outside Agencies. Among studies reported are those which concern the relationship of a college to its community — as, for example, "Los Angeles Pierce College Serves Its Community." "Hospital Survey: at Fresno City College was made as an aid to arriving at a decision regarding the establishment of a two-year program for the preparation of nurses.

Finance. Little attention is given to finance in studies submitted for the present survey Chaffey College sends two studies of junior college finance in California, and the Los Angeles Junior College District has studies of adult education tuition fees.

Teaching. Least frequently reported in the three surveys here summarized are studies of teaching. None was submitted for the present survey; and only one ("Analysis of Remedial Instruction for Low Ability Students" at Los Angeles City College) was included in Swanson's summary of institutional research in Los Angeles Junior Colleges. Although Sprague classifies five junior college studies under "Teaching Methods," only one of these ("Experimental Study of T. V. Teaching and T. V. Production" at Pueblo Junior College) would appear to be directly related to teaching procedures.[11] Three of the other four are studies of testing and grading and the fourth is an investigation of the distribution of class sizes.

The minimal attention given to investigation of teaching is particularly striking in view of the fact that the junior college is basically a teaching institution.

Suggestions for conference program. Participants in this survey were invited to make suggestions for the program of a conference on institutional research in the junior college which we were planning. Twenty respondents to this invitation made nine different proposals. The various suggestions made are singled out for comment because it is believed that they may be helpful in identifying some of the problems which concern junior college administrators as they consider the development of programs of instituional research.

Most often mentioned (six times) are methods for disseminating the findings of studies. Three respondents express an interest in methods of justifying the costs of institutional research, and a like number an interest in effective types of organization for institutional research. Two replies suggest considering the adoption of consistent terminology in reporting junior college statistics, and two also propose considering means of encouraging effective use of the findings of institutional research.

Other topics suggested for consideration are types of research in which a college should engage continuously — year after year; values of and methods of cooperative research by two or more colleges; values of a full-time versus a part-time director of research; and values of having a coordinating committee for institutional research versus having an individual serve as coordinator of research.

---

[10] Sprague. op. cit. p. 23.
[11] Sprague op. cit. pp. 66-68.

An examination of the various proposals for the program of this conference suggests a particular concern for and interest in the exchange and use of the findings of institutional research, effective types of organization, and means of justifying the costs of institutional research.

TABLE VII

SUGGESTED TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION AT CONFERENCE ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Suggestions	Frequency
Plans for the exchange and dissemination of research findings among junior colleges	6
How to justify the costs of instituitional research	3
Effective types of organization for institutional research	3
The adoption of consistent terminology in reporting junior college statistics	2
Means of encouraging the effective use of the findings of institutional research studies	2
Types of research in which a college should engage continuously — year after year	1
Values of and methods of cooperative research by two or more colleges	1
Value of a full-time versus a part-time director of research	1
Value of having a coordinating committee for institutional research versus having an individual serve as coordinator of research	1

Conclusions. Among the conclusions which can be drawn from this survey are these:

1. Junior colleges engage in considerable institutional research.
2. The amount of institutional research varies widely from college to college — with more than one-fourth of the colleges reporting "little research."
3. Less than one-third of the colleges have even part-time coordinators of research. Many — and apparently most — two-year colleges, give only casual attention to the conduct of and organization for institutional research.
4. Consultants are seldom used as aids to junior college programs of institutional research.
5. Only half of the colleges maintain central files for reports of institutional research.
6. It appears that comparatively few faculty members participate in institutional research.
7. A number of administrators express concern about justifying the costs of institutional research.
8. Although little evidence was assembled regarding use of the findings of institutional studies, several respondents express a need for encouraging the effective use of such findings.
9. A number of administrators point out the importance of disseminating the findings of studies made by junior colleges.
10. Although a wide range of problems and subjects are investigated, instruction and methods of teaching are notably neglected.
11. Both the quality of research and the effectiveness of reporting varies widely from college to college. In all too many colleges the quality of research is distinctly inferior.

As I have assembled the findings and conclusions of the survey I am reporting — and particularly as I have noted some of the current difficulties and problems in junior college porgrams of institutional research — my memories have returned to Stephens College where I served as dean of instruction for more than twenty years.

A central element in the four-sentence statement of Stephens College philosophy and practice was this assertion: "The College is committed to research and experimentation in developing its program." In accordance with this commitment the Research Service of the college was recognized as a unit of basic importance. In order to infuse the research viewpoint into every phase of the program, the work of the Service was decentralized. Instead of depending upon a small central staff to carry on research, the Service encouraged and helped all members of the faculty to apply the techniques of research to the study of their particular problems. During the two years from 1947 to 1949, for example, 140 projects, carried out by more than 250 students and faculty, were calendared for investigation. Some idea of the variety of these studies may be suggested by listing a few titles:

The status of the superior student at Stephens College.
Classroom honesty -- an investigation by a student committee.
The development of an occupational index of alumnae.
The construction of manuals for the training of students who worked in dining rooms as waitresses.
A study of the cost of textbooks and other materials students are required to buy for the various courses in the curriculum.
A study of the effectiveness of the opaque projector in teaching students to interpret test profiles.
A study of student achievement in elementary French classes meeting five hours per week compared with that in classes meeting three hours per week.
Diagnostic testing as a basis for teaching speech.

Each of these studies developed from a problem, a felt need in the study of which the assistance of the Research Service was elicited. The value and importance of decentralization of the type which I have described is suggested by Kurt Lewin's assertion, ". . . the extent to which social research is translated into social action depends on the degree to which those who carry out this action are made a part of the fact-finding on which the action is based."[12]

An important factor in the development of the Stephens program was the faculty's knowledge that the Director of the Research Service -- whether he was a full-time member of the staff, or, as was usual, a consultant who came to campus several times a year -- was available for help and planning and carrying out studies.

One device which was used in designing and calendaring studies, as well as in developing the central research file, was the Problem Statement Blank. On this sheet would be recorded the project number (60-42, for example, would for filing purposes designate project number 42 in the 1960-61 college year). Title of the Study, Purpose of the Study, and Methods of Procedure. Under methods would be listed not only steps in the investigation but typically, also the date at which it was anticipated, that each step would be completed.

The Stephens College plan of research was completely voluntary -- but, I must assert, highly stimulating, often bringing out the "eager beaver" in those of us on the staff. Quite consistently as problems arose or issues were raised the injunction of the Director of Research would be, "Let's get the facts, and let's study them."

As I contemplate the current status of institutional research in junior colleges and as I harken back to developments at Stephens College, it seems clear that some of the practices there may aid other programs of institutional research in expanding, quantitatively; in strengthening, qualitatively; and particularly in translating the results of research into action -- as a result of wide participation with expert guidance and assistance. These directions can be, I am convinced, centrally important in strengthening out colleges.

B. The Junior College Library.

Upon occasion we hear such statements as, "The library is the center of the junior college"; "The library is the universal laboratory of the college"; "The library is the heart of the college." The repeated use of such expressions as these by administrators and other educational leaders brings a certain glow of satisfaction to the uncritical listener. Actually, however, the library is not the center of the college, not the universal laboratory of the college, not the heart of the college. In fact, as I observe junior college libraries, I actually raise this question: Has the library yet achieved the dignity of becoming the tonsils or the little finger of the two-year college?

Please do not misunderstand me: To my mind the library should be central in the educational program of the junior college. What I am saying is simply this: The library has by no means attained the position and stature which it must have if our junior colleges are to function as effectively.

It will not this forenoon be my purpose to review the statistics of junior college libraries -- small and too often inadequate book collections, overburdened and frequently underpaid librarians, unattractive housing and inadequate seating capacity. Rather I should like to direct your particular attention to the possibility of vitalizing a junior college library -- of performing the miracle, if you will, of transforming a little finger into veritably the heart of the institution.

---

[12] Kurt Lewin. Resolving Social Conflicts. p. 68., Harper, 1948.

If a college is to vitalize its library, the wholehearted cooperation, support and leadership of three groups is essential: first, the administration; second, the teaching faculty; and, third, the library staff.

I mention administration first because the interest and leadership of the president and the dean are necessary to a really dynamic library program. The first responsibility of the administrator is to provide adequate funds for library books, supplies, equipment, staff, and housing. I am aware that this is often a difficult problem -- for there are many demands upon the too often limited available funds. And yet it has been my experience that when I find a president who is sold on the central importance of library service, I find an administrator who has allocated adequate funds to the library -- perhaps the five per cent of the educational budget recommended the 1960 Standards for Junior College Libraries. A guidline well worth considering was suggested by the late W. W. Charters, who asserted, "If I were an educational administrator, the first charge against the budget, after faculty salaries, would be for the library."

A second responsibility of the administrator is to employ a highly qualified librarian and library staff. The librarian must be capable of assuming leadership and he must be given responsibility. The librarian's duties are not clerical; they are educational, inspirational, instructional. If in any college, librarians are mere keepers and organizers of books, the president must be held responsible -- either for failing to employ qualified librarians or for failing to establish conditions under which vital leadership can be exerted from the library.

Third, the administrator must show a personal interest in the library -- be a visitor to and user of the library, a willing consultant and friend to the librarian and staff. The library needs stimulating supervision fully as much as does any course or department in the curriculum.

And finally, the administrator should use the library as an agent of instructional improvement. I dare say that on most campuses there is no one person who knows as much about the teaching being done on his campus as the librarian. If an instructor gives vague and indefinite assignments, who knows it? The librarian. If an instructor uses a steretyped textbook method, who knows it? The librarian, again -- for the students of such instructors do not darken the doors of the library. On the other hand, if an instructor is an inspired guide, a leader of youth, who knows it? The librarian knows it -- for he sees the purposeful enthusiasm of students as they come to the library. I am not proposing that the president or dean use the librarian as a means of getting "the low-down" on the faculty -- for that would be snoopervision, not supervision. I am, however, suggesting that the administrator use the librarian as a salesman of service, and as an aid to instructors. (Service on college committees on instruction and curriculum is a "must" for the librarian.)

In using the library as an aid to instructional improvement the administrator can himself spend time in the library.

A number of years ago I made a study, during which I invited thirty-two junior college administrators to work in their college libraries and to report on a one-sheet inquiry the results of their observations. Questions to which administrators responded included these:

What new light did your work in the library throw upon the strength and successes of individual instructors?

What new light did your work in the library throw upon the problems and difficulties of individual instructors?

What suggestions for improving the library and library-instructional relationships emerged from your work in your library?

I shall not here report the findings of this survey other than to indicate that twenty administrators reported that the value of their work in the library was sufficient to warrant their regularly spending time there.

I wish to reiterate: major responsibility for the effectiveness of library service rests upon you, junior college presidents and deans. Without your energetic support, the little finger will never become the heart; it will simply shrink into a smaller and withered little finger. With your support, your guidance, your encouragement, the possibilities of the junior college library are limitless.

The administrator alone cannot, however, perform the miracle of transformation. He must have the intelligent and enthusiastic support of the faculty. Regardless of the size and quality of the book collection, the attractiveness and adequacy of library housing, and the effectiveness of library organization, library materials will be used little, if at all, unless methods of teaching at the college are such as to require the use of the library. To instructors, I wish to make three suggestions:

First, get acquainted with the materials available to you in the college library. Visit the library; use it personally; survey its holdings — both informally and systematically. You cannot use your library effectively, if you do not know what is in it.

Second, to the greatest extent possible substitute the library methods for the textbook method. This involves, in many cases, using a wide range of library books as texts. If you are committed to such a plan, you may need continually to press the administration for necessary books. This is all to the good, however.

My third suggestion is this: work with your students in the presence of appropriate and stimulating books. The value of books is often increased many-fold when students have opportunity to use books at such times and places as will make it convenient for them to consult with their instructors. Some teachers hold office hours in the college library; others have classroom libraries; and still others have classes, upon occasion, meet in the library — actually using the library as a laboratory.

Faculty members, a major responsibility for the effective use of the library rests with you. If you know your library and if you effectively use its resources in your teaching, you are contributing to the miracle of transforming a little finger into a heart.

I have discussed the importance of the administrator and of faculty members in vitalizing a college library. But let us not forget the role of the library staff. My first suggestion to librarians is this: be pleasant, be courteous, be accommodating. In short, make the library a place where students enjoy working and where faculty members feel welcome. Remember a long-faced librarian can transform the most pleasant and attractive reading room into a morgue-like atmosphere. On the other hand, a librarian with tact, vision, warmth can make much out of little.

My second suggestion is really an amplification of the first. It is this: use the limit of your initiative in adapting your library and its administration to the individual needs of each instructor and of each course which he teaches. We talk a great deal about individualized instruction; we must begin to think in terms of individualized library administration. Some teachers may need classroom libraries -- or perhaps temporary loans to classrooms, some may wish to have classes meet in a library reading room at the time that assignments involving use of library materials are being initiated. These are needs which may at times be inconvenient for the library staff. They may, however, be of central importance to effective teaching. In summary, may I suggest to my colleagues in library staffs: if your library rules interfere with educational service, break the rules -- for no rule is an end to itself. And above all -- seek every opportunity to individualize library service to the needs of each individual course and instructor.

One of the major problems in the effective utilization of the library emerges from the fact that the three groups primarily concerned with such utilization rarely get together. Librarians tend to get together and talk about teachers -- how they make assignments to students before they put books on reserve, how they make assignments to books which the library doesn't even own -- and so on. And instructors get together and talk about the library staff — how interminably long it takes to get books after they are ordered, how librarians are vastly more interested in safeguarding books, having them on the shelves than in having them used — and so on. And then the administrators assemble — and they talk about both instructors and librarians, noting that faculty members just don't use the library and condemning librarians in general — and their librarians in particular -- for being keepers of books.

And the paradoxical fact is that these three groups — or, indeed, any two of them -- rarely get together to share views and to make plans for improvement. In the meantime the neglected library remains a little finger of the college -- while administrators, librarians, instructors engage in continuing recrimination, one with another.

The opportunity to which I refer is tremendous -- for it is the opportunity of bringing to our colleges, through books, the greatest minds of this and all past ages. But this possibility is not an easy one to realize. It requires united efforts along lines which I have suggested. I have, however, an additional proposal for your consideration. It is this: I suggest that every college here represented this next year initiate a series of studies designed to stimulate and coordinate the best thinking of those who are basically responsible for the library and particularly for its use.

More specifically I propose two studies in each college.

First, a study in which one or more administrators (presidents, dean of instruction, division or department chairman) spend a minimum of three hours working in his college library and report on an inquiry form the results of his observations. This is a study which can be made by single institutions -- or, if you prefer, it can be a cooperative study -- with results from each participating college sent to a central agency where it could be summarized and the findings disseminated to all participating colleges.

Second, a college-wide survey of library-institutional relationships in which librarians and instructors would participate. More specifically, instructors would be asked such questions as these:

1. What does the library do to help you achieve your teaching objectives ?
2. What additional would you suggest that the library do to help you achieve your teaching objectives ?
3. What does the library do that hinders you in achieving your teaching objectives ?
4. What do you do in using the library as an aid to achieving your teaching olbjectives ?
5. What additional might you to advantage do in using the library as an aid to achieving your teaching objectives ?

Librarians might be queried somewhat as follows:

1. What do instructors do in making effective use of the library as an aid to achieving their teaching objectives ?
2. What additional would you suggest that instructors do in making effective use of the library as an aid to achieving their teaching objectives ?
3. What do instructors do which interferes with the effective use of the library by their students ?
4. What do you do to encourage and assist instructors in making effective use of the li library as an aid to achieving their teaching objectives ?
5. What additional might you to advantage do to encourage and assist instructors in making effective use of the library as an aid to achieving their teaching objectives ?

If we wish to include students in our survey -- and this has many potential values -- they could be asked.

1. What do your instructors do to encourage and assist (and, indeed, perhaps require) you in making effective use of the library ?
2. What additional would you suggest that instructors do to encourage and assist (and, indeed, perhaps require) you in making effective use of the library ?
3. What do instructors do that interferes with your effective use of the library ?
4. What does the library staff do to assist you in making effective use of the library ?
5. What additional would you suggest that the library staff do to assist you in making more effective use of the library ?
6. What does the library staff do that interferes with your effective use of the library ?

Again this survey could be carried out independently by an individual college. Or, if you are interested studies from various colleges could be coordinated by having findings from participating institutions summarize at a centralized agency.

C. Conclusion.

The basic task of administration is to provide a competent staff and to create conditions under which staff members can do their best work. This forenoon I have discussed two segments of the junior college program which can contribute notably to providing an environment which stimulates, aids, and supports faculty members in making their optimum contributions to the achievement of college objectives.

STEPHENS COLLEGE RESEARCH BLANK
Problem Statement Blank

Project Number:

Title of the Study:

Purpose of the Study:
(What prompted the study? What will be its uses? What is covered and what is not covered by the study?)

Methods of Procedure:
(Please give in detail the exact steps you contemplate taking to carry out this study.)

MANAGEMENT IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

By Dr. Duncan Wimpress
President, Monticello College
Alton, Illinois

Dr. Wiegman asked me to speak today on the topic of "management." "Management," of course, is a topic which covers many activities and many areas, some of which already have been discussed at this Institute during the past several days. Dr. Johns has spoken on organizational structure, Dr. Hardee on student personnel services, and Dr. Johnson on institutional research in libraries. Tomorrow, Dr. Williams will speak on personnel. These, I believe, are all parts of the overall function of management. There are many others. I would like to limit my remarks on "management" somewhat today, then, and share a few thoughts with you about only one area of this broad field — one which perhaps is almost distasteful to some of you, but, certainly, one which is basic to all of your institutions — the area of financial support.

It's an obvious comment to say that we all must have funds to make our total institutional programs run. We can talk until the end of time about organization and about all of the other services we would like to perform, but if we don't have the funds to accomplish our goals, our efforts are wasted. I think it's true also that those of you who are presidents or other top administrative officers of your institutions inevitably spend a large share of your time thinking about and working with problems in the area of financial support. This isn't always as we would have it, but I am sure that, in most cases at least, it's true.

I am always a little reluctant to talk about financial support for education because there is a danger inherent in this topic. Perhaps I can pass it along to you best by a story of something that happened to me not so long ago. I was giving a talk before a service club in a little town in upstate Illinois, and, as is the habit of college presidents most places, I had chosen as my topic the financial problems and difficulties of higher education in our state. During my talk, I noticed in the audience a young fellow taking notes and I assumed that he was a reporter for the local paper. Naturally, I was interested to see how this young man would cover my speech, so, before I left town the next day, I picked up a copy of the local paper, Sure enough, I had been right — he had been a reporter from the local paper and he had written an article about my talk. I read the article and thought it was extremely well done. He had emphasized the points I had tried to emphasize and was most kind in his treatment of my remarks. As far as I was concerned, there was only one thing wrong with the story. The headline which ran across the top of the story of my speech on college financial problems read: "Wimpress Shows Need of Higher Education." So, you see, one must always be careful about this topic!

For purposes of discussion, I would like to divide the area of financial support into three principal categories. I am aware of certain weaknesses in making this arbitrary division among the several sources of support, but I am doing it anyway, solely for ease in discussion.

The first division I will call earned income. By this I mean income from student tuition and fees plus income from supplemental services. Concerning this division, I would say only that this income will not do the entire job of supporting your institution in most cases. The second category or source of income I will discuss is public support from local, state, or federal governments. As I will mention in a few moments, in my opinion, this source of income should not do the entire job. It might be able to, but it should not. The third source of income I will term private support, philanthropic support, support from non-governmental groups. This category I would call a means of doing a better job and I would emphasize this regardless of the type of institution you represent. Private gift support is a route to doing an even better job than you are now doing.

First of all, let's talk about the area of earned income — student tuition and fees and income from supplemental services. Let's begin with supplemental services. By supplemental services, I mean such things as bookstore and soda fountain income, receipts from income property, rental from the use of facilities of your institution in the summer, and other similar types of income. These income sources, of course, vary widely among institutions. Where some institutions will have a considerable income from these sources, others will not. There is little I can say about this area, other than to wish that we at Monticello had more income from it. Supplemental services vary so widely that I think any extended comment made about this source of income would be pretty much superfluous. It will suffice to say that income from these sources can be meaningful and that they should carefully be developed to the fullest extent possible as long as they don't interfere with the educational function of the institution nor divert administrative attention from it.

Address given at the Summer Institute for Junior College Administration Teams, August 3, 1961.

Let's move on to tuition and fees as a source of income. I would hold that of all of sources of income, this one has perhaps the greatest relationship to your institutional purposes. Tuition and fees are much more than just a source of support. They are a concrete indication of your institutional philosophy. They should be carefully examined in this light.. Your schedule of tuition and fees is a way of describing your philosophy to the people who are concerned with your institution, and it does it in dollars and cents -- a pretty effective way to do it.

I would claim that too many tuition charges, too many fee schedules are set on such bases as what the traffic will bear. This is not a pleasant remark. It is nonetheless, I think, true in some institutions. Tuition schedules also are set occasionally on the basis of what other institutions charge. How many of you are familiar with situations in which new tuition schedules have been established? Public institutions may have had to go to a legislature or private institutions to a Board of Trustees in order to make changes in the tuition charges. What did these colleges do? They surveyed a number of other institutions to determine what these institutions are charging. This information then became the basis upon which the new tuition charge was established. I would claim that the charges of other colleges should not be the rationale for establishing a tuition schedule -- the tuition and fees should be set on the basis of each institution's unique philosophy and purposes.

If your primary institutional purpose is to provide higher education for the many fine young people who otherwise could not afford it, your tuition and fees should be kept as low as possible and other sources of support should be promoted vigorously. If you have other primary institutional purposes, as for instance my institution does, your tuition may tend to be higher. But, the point remains that fees and tuition should tie logically and directly to and should reflect your institutional philosophy and purposes. Beyond this, I have no valid comment about tuition and fees because, again, they very widely among institutions.

Now, let's take public support. There are, of course, several sources of public support -- local and/or state support for operating costs and capital expenditures, federal loans and grants for scholarships, capital expense, research projects, etc. Again, I think this area of support has some tie to institutional philosophy, particularly among some private institutions. As an example, some private institutions are taking a deliberate philosophical stand to decline federal support on the basis that they wish to remain entirely independent. Others do not feel that the acceptance of such support jeopardizes their traditional independence. It is true, however, that the acceptance of public support -- and for some this is automatic and not a matter of question at all -- the acceptance of public support tends to mold and reflect institutional philosophy and should be considered in this light. Whether an institution is going to seek federal support and how it should utilize such support cannot be commented upon in general with much validity by one individual because institutions themselves vary so widely so I will move on to the area of state and/or local public support.

Though I now represent a private institution, I did work for a state-supported college for seven years with one of my primary responsibilities being the institution's legislative relationships. I can't speak specifically, of course, about each state represented here, but I can give from my experience two general principles which I believe are applicable to public institutions as a whole. These are obvious principles, but I think you may find that we don't live up to them quite as often as we could.

First, I would say almost flatly that public institutions in the long run can gain the greatest support through inter-institutional cooperation. Those of you who have had no experience with public institutions may think this not only is an obvious remark, but a fairly inconsequential one as well. I'm sure that those who represent public institutions will recognize that, on the contrary, inter-institutional cooperation is often a large and more difficult problem among public institutions than those on the outside may realize. Such cooperation can be accomplsihed, however, despite what sometimes appear to be insurmountable obstacles.

As an example, for many years the state-supported educational institutions in Colorado competed for legislative favor on an openly dog-eat-dog basis. Bitter competition was the rule. The ones who were able to reach the most legislators first or last, depending upon the individual legislator, ended with the greatest legislative support. This situation led to many questionable practices and certainly did nothing to enhance the stature of higher education in the state. About six or seven years ago, the seven state institutions of higher education in Colorado joined together to form an organization to which they attached an absolutely incredible name which I shall not attempt to remember. Colloquially, the organization was known as the Presidents' Association. Through this organization, established on a volunteer basis, and stressing the hard-headed advantages of inter-institutional cooperation on a continuing basis, we were finally able to achieve a working group committed to the cooperation concept. The result? All seven state institutions are now receiving far more support from the legislature than at any time in the past.

The same thing has happened in Iowa. Dr. Myers and I produced a film for the Colorado people to present the need for capital funds to the legislature. The Iowa group used our film and much of our other material. Their results were similar to those in Colorado. This is not an argument for the chancellor system. Such a question is beyond the scope of my talk and I haven't any idea if it would work in your state. It is, however, a statement that the principle of inter-institutional cooperation will work among publicly-supported institutions whether this seems possible at present or not. In the long run, if you work at it hard enough, it will yield many benefits.

My second principle is also obvious, but again, is one which many state-supported institutions overlook. If you in public institutions are to gain continuing and growing public support, you must keep the public and the legislative groups informed on what you are doing. It is foolish to expect meaningful support from a legislature or a public which knows little about your institution and hears about it only once or twice a year. You should keep these people informed on a continuing basis. If the individual members of the public body which decides upon your appropriation from tax funds is not now on your regular institutional mailing list, you are missing a bet. They certainly should be. Granted that a legislator or some other public official may discard much of the material you send him, but he can never complain that he is unable to vote in favor of your appropriation request because he doesn't know enough about your institution.

To be effective, a public information program must be continuous. Despite the many derogatory comments about them, legislators and other public officials are too intelligent to be taken in by a sudden rush of publicity about your institution just prior to the time that your appropriation request comes before them. Surprisingly enough, however, this is precisely the technique followed by many public institutions. A spotty publicity program, aimed at critical times during the year, may actually hurt an institution, but a continuous, on-going program of public information will pay real dividends over the years.

Let's move now from the area of public support to the area of private support. I would say at the outset that development and fund raising hold great opportunity and real potential value for every type of institution whether it be public or private. I am aware that this is a controversial statement, but I believe it firmly.

Many think the growing area of fund raising is a relatively recent phenomenon. Not so. Monticello College was founded in 1835 and the first president spent a good deal of time raising money. This hasn't changed in 126 years.

Traditionally, fund raising has been emphasized by the private institutions, but it can provide a meaningful source of support for the public institution as well. I would say flatly that the public or private institution which is not raising some gift funds today is not doing the academic job it could do. The University of California realizes a gift income of something over $8,000,000 a year to supplement a budget of approximately $122,000,000. The University does a better academic job because of these supplementary funds. The University of Michigan has had phenomenal success in private fund raising. The Colorado School of Mines, a smaller institution, receives over $200,000 a year in gift money to supplement its state support through a program which Dr. Myers and I helped to create. There are many other examples. Because of their fund raising activities, all of these institutions are able to carry on a stronger academic program than they could on public support alone.

Many representatives of private institutions will object to my encouraging the public institutions to seek gift funds. They may even feel that, as a representative of a private institution, I have betrayed the cause of private higher education. I don't believe this is true. All of us, private and public institutions together, have barely scratched the surface of the fund raising potential for higher education in this country. At this point in our history, the more institutions which are directing the attention of potential donors to the needs of higher education in general, the better it is for all institutions. A broad base of development activity helps to establish a climate within which all of us can operate more successful.

I would suggest one ground rule for public institutions engaged in private fund raising and I would hold that it is a rule they must follow if they are truly interested in the total picture of American higher education. Don't steal donors from private institutions. You are seeking supplemental funds. The private institution is seeking life blood. If you find a potential donor is interested in a private institution, encourage him to support that institution and look elsewhere for your own gift funds. This may sound idealized, but it can be made to work as a policy.

While I was on the staff of the Colorado School of Mines, we made an approach to a large company in Denver for philanthropic support. This company had a natural interest in our college because we educated the type of engineers it needed. After we had told the story of our needs to the president of the company, he pointed out that he felt his company should support us, but that only a certain amount of company funds could be budgeted each year for gifts to higher education.

At the time, he said, the total amount was being given to support the University of Denver, a private institution. He then indicated that his company would be willing to split the amount in the future and give half of it to the University and half to the School of Mines. We responded by declining his offer. We pointed out that splitting the amount would not accomplish more for higher education, but might actually achieve less and we asked that either his company give to the School of Mines in addition to what it was already giving to the University of Denver or that it not support our institution at all.

I wish I could tell you that he agreed to increase his company's total support for education. He did not. We received no gift funds. The story reached the University of Denver campus, however, and resulted in greatly strengthened relationships between our two institutions which ultimately proved even more valuable than the company gift would have been. In addition, we gained the respect of the company president and I am sure that when his company does increase its support of education, the School of Mines will be at the top of the list.

There are many potential donors who are not now interested in private institutions and who can be encouraged by public institutions to support higher education. These are the ones toward which the public institutions should aim. Labor unions are a case in point. Monticello College students generally come from a fairly substantial socio-economic level. We are a two-year, liberal arts college for women. The labor unions in our area are not particularly interested in giving to us. I can't see how we could develop a meaningful and successful appeal for gift support from the plumbers' union in our state and neither can they. Recently, Southern Illinois University embarked on a major fund raising program in our area. They have approached the labor unions and the unions are now giving substantially to support higher education. They are not giving to Monticello, but they are giving to Southern and they were giving to no one previously. They wouldn't have supported us anyway, but as they support Southern and their gift support is publicized, the public in our area gets the feeling that more and more people are interested generally in the support of higher education. This helps to establish a better climate within which we can raise funds from those people who are interested in Monticello. Southern's efforts within the labor unions actually will help us materially.

Another example of prospects toward whom a public institution might aim is the people in the immediate vicinity of the college. The fellow who may never have attended your institution, but who always comes to your football games, is a potential donor. He may never give to any institution unless he gives to yours, regardless of whether your institution is public or private. If you can start him supporting higher education, you are helping the case of all institutions.

If you in the public institutions, then, will work with the private institutions and not against them in the field of fund raising, you will do much to help them to survive and prosper as well as to improve your own programs. By working together intelligently, we can establish an even stronger climate for the support of junior college education from all sources.

Some public institutions are fearful of the idea of raising funds because of its possible effect of reducing support from the legislature or local public bodies. We were concerned about this possibility when we established a development program at Colorado Mines and we watched carefully to see that it did not happen. We needed to have no fear. Quite the contrary occurred. As our development program progressed, as our gift support grew, our legislative appropriation became larger. We found that legislatures help those who help themselves and the fact that we were attempting to develop additional sources of income rather than just to ask the state for more money had a beneficial effect on those who voted our appropriation each year. We thought this might be a phenomenon peculiar to Colorado, but my good friend, Alan McCarthy, who heads the development program at the University of Michigan, has told me that the same thing happened in their state. I have checked elsewhere and have found that the principle seems to hold true generally. Successful fund raising activities not only do not seem to cause a reduction of state or local public support, but on the contrary, they seem to cause it to increase.

I haven't mentioned support from church groups or other private organizations, but the same principles apply to them as to legislative or public groups. Keep them informed on a continuing basis and strive for inter-institutional cooperation. These activities will help to create the climate you need to gain their growing interest and backing.

If we accept the idea that fund raising is an activity which should be carried on by both the private and the public institutions, it follows that the remarks which I will now make are applicable to all institutions represented here today.

In speaking about development programs, I would like to say that, contrary to what many people seem to think, successful fund raising is rarely luck. Many of you may receive, as I do, a little publication from the John Price Jones Company called Philanthropic Digest. This publication lists many of the gifts which are made each month to various institutions, educational and other types, throughout the country. Frankly, reading this publication can be a most discouraging experience. It always seems as if everyone in higher education is receiving major gifts except your instituion. There's a tendency to wish our institution were as "lucky" as those which seem to be listed in the Philanthropic Digest time after time. This isn't luck.

Some of you have heard the story of Walter P. Murphy and his support of Northwestern University. As a prospective donor, Walter Murphy was first approached by Tom Gonser who was then on the Northwestern staff. He gave nothing. The people at Northwestern then began a continuing program aimed at interesting Mr. Murphy in their institution. After seventeen years, during which time Northwestern kept in continued contact with Mr. Murphy, he made his first gift to the University. It totaled over a million dollars. But the staff of Northwestern did not stop then. They continued to bring to Mr. Murphy the story of what they were seeking to accomplish, of the purposes and values of their instituion. Over the succeeding six years, Mr. Murphy made additional gifts until his support of Northwestern over a twenty-three year period totaled a magnificent $27,000,000. Mr. Murphy built the College of Engineering at Northwestern. The Northwestern people could have given up during those seventeen years when Mr. Murphy gave them nothing, but they didn't. They persevered. Yet, some of the people who read about Mr. Murphy's gifts to the University probably commented on the fabulous luck of Northwestern.

Naturally, every development program will realize occasional windfalls. Once in a while someone will give you some funds you really didn't expect, but ordinarily you can't simply sit in your office with your development apron hopefully held out waiting for pennies from heaven. It just doesn't work that way.

In building a development program, the first thing which must be done is the definition of your institutional purpose or purposes. If you don't make clear those things for which your institution stands, you can't expect people to support it. It is a common fault to assume that a potential donor understands your institution and its objectives. This is a basic error. Make sure your institutional purposes are defined and in writing so as to form a core around which your entire development program can be constructed.

After the functions, the purposes of your college are defined, you must go about building a development staff. Like most other areas of collegiate administration, the development program always seems to need more staff than is available. Obviously, it is necessary to determine how much of your staff's time and effort can be devoted to development or how many people you can affort to hire for this work. Once this is determined, plan your program within the scope of the staff capabilities. Don't try to match Harvard's fund raising program with a part-time secretary.

Regardless of how many staff people you can afford, the president of your instituion must be the actual head of the development program. Prospective donors who are being approached by your institution for large gifts have a right to expect that you care enough about their support to involve the president in conversations with them. You can hardly send one of the staff members to talk with the president of a large corporation about gift support for your institution and expect him to be impressed that your college really needs money. The head of the institution inevitably must do a good deal of the development work himself. Staff, however, can help immeasurably by doing leg work, researching prospects, building prospect files, preparing brochures, writing and designing individual presentations, etc.

As I mentioned, a problem that most of us face in the development program is the question of whether we should add more people in this important area. We usually are aware of prospects not being contacted, publications not being produced, and other development work being let slide because of insufficient personnel. I would suggest one criterion upon which this decision might be made. Ask yourself realistically, is there potential gift income for our institution sufficient to justify another man? Will he pay for himself? Is there enough potential that one more man will bring in more new income than he will cost? The answer to this question, of course, varies with each institution and its potential.

There are other criteria. How much leg work can be done by the present staff without interfering with your education program? As an example, is there a girl in the business office who can keep books and free the business manager for some development work? Are there other offices where personnel can help with development on a part-time basis?

If no one in your management group has experience in development, I would suggest one of two solutions: either hire someone who has such experience or bring in a consultant to help you establish a program and to train your own staff people. Retaining a development consultant can save you many hours of worry and many dollars of expense in the long run.

There are several types of consulting services in the development field. They range from large fund-raising firms such as Marts and Lundy and John Price Jones, through continuous consultants such as Gonser and Gerber in Chicago, to individual consultants who visit only occasionally. The fund-raising firm will tend to be oriented toward capital fund campaigns and the campaign approach. The continuous consultants will be inclined to help you develop a program rather than a fund campaign, one which will have less immediate impact, but will be set up on a continuing basis. These consultants will visit your campus for two days every month and will advise on several phases of your operation which affect the development area. The individual consultant will usually be someone who presently is working at an educational institution and who has had considerable experience in development. He will normally help you establish your program and then will visit you only upon your invitation to review your progress with you and make further suggestions. There are a number of presidents and other people in development work who do this type of consulting. I do a good deal of it. There are many others.

The cost of these services ordinarily will range in the order I have mentioned them with the large fund raising firm the most expensive and the individual consultant the least costly. It is true, however that the immediate return, at least, in terms of gift income will tend to range in the same direction also. I'm sure that some of you are thinking that the hiring of a consultant and the creation of a development program is fine in theory, but that your institution simply can't afford this type of activity. I would respond with two comments. First, because it will mean a stronger academic program for your institution, you really can't afford to be without it and, second, the program will ultimately pay for itself.

Unsually, it is difficult suddenly to add the cost of a development program to an institutional budget and sometimes, at a public instituion, this is not possible at all. My recommendation is that you not attempt this solution. Seek out one or more donors who will make restricted gifts for this specific purpose in order to prevent your Board from deciding to use the money for some other end. The appeal to donors for this type of gift is a strong one as it can be pointed out that if they give dollars to support a development program, their contributions will result in still more gift dollars coming to the instituion and, thus, will benefit your college many times over the actual amount of their philanthropy.

As soon as your development program is initiated, you must look among your institutional constituencies for potential sources of gift support. Let's consider a few of them.

First, I would mention your alumni. Your alumni must give to your institution if other donors are expected to give. I am aware that alumni giving is more difficult to develop at some institutions than at others, but unless there is some evidence of support from your alumni, from the people who have benefitted from your educational program, the disinterested potential donor -- the person in town, the corporation, the foundation -- cannot be expected to give significantly. Your alumni must provide leadership to other donors.

Your governing Board also must provide leadership in this area. Some of your institutions have Boards whose members were not chosen with philanthropy in mind. Some have boards with elected memberships. Those on your governing Board who are not in a position to give financially can support you in other ways. Henry Wriston once said that he required at least two of three specific qualities of every member of his Board. Those qualities were wealth, wisdom, and work. Perhaps a less sophisticated way of putting it is that every Board member be required to "give, git, or git off." The Board member who cannot give himself can work to encourage gift support from others. He occupies a position of prestige by virtue of being on your Board and he can use this position to benefit your institution by raising funds.

Another important source of potential gift dollars is your local community. Individuals in your town, the follow who attends all the college football games, the nice lady who lives across the street and has always been interested in the school, these and many others are potential donors. They should be developed.

The parents of your students are often prospective donors. Some of you may be thinking that this applies if the families of the students are wealthy, but that it is not significant in your case because most of your students come from families of limited means. Please note that in discussing support from your several constituencies, I have not mentioned either maximums or minimums. Some parents may give you one dollar. This is gift support. Gifts need not be large to be significant and the way they mount up in a well - run program is surprising.

Business and industry is another potential source of gift support. Most of you will find that local business and industry will provide many fruitful prospects; national business and industry will not. Many local businessmen will support scholarships, purchase of needed equipment, and other relatively small costs of the college. Dramatize your economic value to the community and you will find that your downtown businessmen will respond in kind.

Philanthropic foundations always should be considered if only for the reason that they are created for the purpose of giving money away. Don't make the mistake of thinking that just because you have heard about the Ford Foundation or the Carnegie Foundation or the Rockefeller Foundation, you can simply write them a letter and receive a grant. As a matter of fact, your chances of receiving support from a national foundation are very slim. Look for small family foundations in your own area. These are established by people with local interests. The competition for their dollars is not so intense. The appraoch can be far less elaborate and much more personal. Buy a copy of American Foundations and Their Fields and study the foundations in your vicinity. You'll find fertile ground.

Church groups obviously are fine potential sources of gift-income. If your institution is church-connected, you have a built-in constituency which should yield much support.

Look for special gift prospects who can be approached in terms of bequests to your instituion. These will be individuals of means, normally, but even small bequests can be meaningful. Many people cannot give to your istitution now, but will be glad to make it one of their beneficiaries.

Students should be considered as prospective donors. Monticello's development program receives one hundred per cent support from our student body each year. Every student on our campus makes a gift to the College. This is organized annually by the students themselves without prodding or interference from the administration. They don't give much, of course, but the fact that they support the college in this fashion has an extremely beneficial effect on alumnae and other potential donors.

There are many other constituencies, of course. I've mentioned only a few which are common to all our institutions. Each college should develop its own list. Remember that these constituencies dovetail. Success with one will help to promote success with another which, in turn, promotes success with still another. If you have success with alumni, the enthusiasm of your Board members will grow and they will add their support. The community and local business will hear about this and will be more inclined to join the cause. When the alumni learn of the support of business, the will be encouraged to increase their giving, and so on. The parts of a development program dovetail and the total effect will be that of a snowball.

After you have defined your constituencies, define your institutional needs. This should be done with the help and cooperation of your faculty so that it is kept in line with the educational purposes of the institution. Then, bring the constituencies and the institutional needs together.

I would suggest that, once your institutional needs are set out, you examine them from a project orientation. Begin to develop specific projects with specific costs built out of your institutional needs and within the framework of your institutional objectives. These projects can range all the way from faculty salaries to a new dishwasher. Even unrestricted funds can be a project if you can make a sound enough case for them. Create "packages" which will be attractive to prospective donors. Seek the help of your faculty in accomplishing this.

Assign projects and packages to certain constituencies to which you think they'll appeal the most. Don't be rigid about this, but establish guide lines. Don't refuse a scholarship from an alumnus just because you've decided that scholarships will make packages of particular attraction to your local businessmen, but set up certain directions in which your development program can move in terms of projects and constituencies.

After this has been accomplished, build the action phase of your development program. To be successful in the final analysis, your development program will require that someone asks someone for money. Certain cases will call for individual approaches. Others can be accomplished through general mailings. There are many, many other techniques.

In general, the project approach has the strongest appeal to donors. The "give us money — we really need it" approach is by far the weakest. One of the easiest projects for which to raise money is books. First, you can talk in small amounts — even as little as enough to buy one book, and second, donors can give actual books rather than money if they so desire. Every institution represented here today could build a stronger library collection through a project of books and there isn't one which couldn't obtain some income this way.

Scholarships also have great appeal to potential donors. It is relatively easy to raise money for scholarships because the idea of supporting a specific young person has dramatic pulling power for many individuals.

Physical facilities, equipment, etc., are a little more difficult projects in terms of raising money, but I would still claim that gift support for them is relatively simple to obtain.

Faculty salaries are more difficult. Unrestricted funds are the most useful to the institution, but also are by far the most difficult to raise. To give unrestricted funds, a donor must be sold on the entire institution, not just a single project.

Now, just a comment or two about the area of development in general. Remember that development is a means to an end, not an end in itself. The ultimate goal is or should be a stronger educational program. The field of development simply offers a means of achieving this objective. Some of us, I regret to say, often act as if the purpose of the institution were to support a development program.

Be sure that people are involved in your development program. The success of your program, I would claim, will vary in direct proportion to the number of people you manage to involve in it. Be sure that faculty, students, alumni, all constituencies and potential donors are given a sense of participation. The inevitable byproduct of a good development program is friends. Your program should raise friends as well as funds. In general, the interest of people goes where their money goes and as your constituencies invest in your institution, their increased interest will follow. They will pay more attention to your college because they have dollars in it.

A good development program is a continuing program and often it grows slowly. It isn't a flashy one-shot effort. It calls for continuous hard work and a great deal of patience. Bear with it, however, work at it, nurture it, and it will repay you and your institution many times over.

There is one additional principle of management which I had hoped to cover, but my time is running out. I will just mention it briefly. It is this: if you do not have a projection of your budget into the years ahead, you are not doing the job of management which could be done at your institution. A budget project for five, ten, or more years has infinite value in helping you to chart the course of your institution, to make long-range decisions, to build your college thoughtfully and carefully in the years ahead. Many people think such a project cannot be done or at least cannot be solid enough to have much meaning. I once thought this, too. We at Monticello College have found that it can be done. Others have also. For example, I can tell you right now how much money we have to raise to balance our budget and accomplish our goals in 1970-71. I can tell you what faculty salaries we will be paying. Naturally, our projection isn't rigid or iron-clad, but it does provide meaningful guidlines to help our planning. A book called Financing Higher Education, 1960-70, published by the McGraw-Hill Book Company in 1959, contains in its seventh chapter an article by Sidney Tickton entitled, "The Long-Term Budget Projection: A New Management Tool for Colleges and Universities." It is an excellent outline of how to make a long-range projection and is worth reading.

Let me close by telling you a little story. It's a story of two men who, while traveling, came to a river wich crossed their path. The first man looked at the river and, finally, dived in, swam across, and went on his way. The second man thought a bit and then took the time to build a bridge. He too, crossed the river and he went on his way. The difference is this: the first man helped only himself. The second man helped himself, but he left a bridge so that others who came that way might cross more easily in the future. He helped others, too. Let all of us, then, so manage our institutions today that we truly build a bridge to tomorrow. Let's not just swim the river now, let's not just solve the current problem. Let's set up our management procedures -- with thought and with care -- in such a way that we build a bridge, a useful bridge, a bridge to the future growth, the future progress of all American junior college education.

FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

by Dr. Kenneth R. Williams
President, Dade County Junior College
Miami, Florida

Mr. Chairman; members of the Administrative Team Workshop.

At first, when I was asked to talk to the group on the subject "Personnel," I accepted the assignment at face value. And then the more I began to think about this, and particularly as I began to get repercussions of rumors running about, I came to believe that maybe there is "more than meets the eye" in my having been asked to speak on this particular topic. This little by-play will not be as much in the consciousness of these who came from out of the state as of those who come within the state to this Conference.

The Dade County Junior College athletic teams have the nickname "Falcons," but as a result of our apparent personnel practices, I understand that there are those in the state who have suggested that we change the name from Dade County Falcons to Dade County "Raiders." In fact, one of my Deans, the Dean of the Academic Studies who is with me at this meeting, was greeted by one of his colleagues from another institution as "Here comes one of Dade's Raiders." The Dade County Junior College staff "caught it again" at one of our recent conferences of Florida Public Junior Colleges, when Presidents of two other institutions were off to one side chatting a bit, and in more than a stage whisper were overheard to say one to the other, "Do you know whether Dade County has completed its staffing yet?" and the reply was, "Yes, I'm sure that it has because we still have some left."

One consolation, however, that some of our other junior college presidents may feel, is the fact that "we have stopped now raiding other institutions and have started raiding ourselves." Dean Pyle came to me about a week ago after I had been away from the campus for a few days and said, "Now this has just got to stop!" and I said, "Well, what's just got to stop?" "Why," he says, "one of our administrative officers has just taken a person from our Math Department and offered him a job in his division -- of course, at a considerably better salary." And I said, "Well, boy, chickens are just coming home to roost now, aren't they?" When we start practicing cannibalism, I guess we have gone the whole range.

I would like to preface my remarks this morning in the words of Franklin Johnson, the President of Jacksonville University, who, in addressing a conference of the Section of Higher Education of the Florida Education Association recently in Jacksonville, said "At the end of my address, I will be very happy to present myself to you for any friendly questions." I feel somewhat the same.

I would like to commence my remarks to you this morning by an observation which you may say is a very trite one in terms of the remark itself. But I am sure that we will all agree that however trite it may be as a remark, it is anything but trite in concept. The observation is: "Personnel, more than any other factor, indeed more than all of the other factors combined, determines the achievement and the success of the junior college, as indeed it would of any institutional organization." To be sure, sound organization is important, but personnel will determine whether the organization is effective or ineffective in its translation. Educational goals and programs of the institution are completely dependent upon the personnel factor, both in the creation and in the translation of these educational goals and programs. For no matter how we state our goals, and no matter what programs are devised, it is the faculty (the personnel) of the institution that will determine whether these are translated effectively. The selection and wise utilization of personnel is surely recognized as the most critical issue faced by our boards, and by our administrative officers, upon whom repose responsibilities for our junior colleges. The personnel factor indeed is the factor of critical incidence in any over-all appraisal of the institution. The success of the institution hinges on this.

In my remarks today we will consider several major areas of concern. There are other ways, to be sure, in which this topic could have been treated, and another individual addressing himself to it would have done it differently. We will have an opportunity in our discussion period to get perhaps much more into details and specifics than I will in my remarks. But we will consider, nonetheless, at least these areas of concern in the personnel areas: recruitment and selection of personnel, deployment of personnel, preparation --both pre-service and in-service, and the factor of morale.

Before progressing from the introductory phases of these remarks, may I be reminded, even as I remind you, that we are in any discussion of the junior college dealing (and you've heard this again and again at this conference) with a unique institution. An observation almost universally vocalized, but almost as universally denied in practice. This I think should give all of us a great deal of concern. We must stop talking about this, and begin to do something about it if we truly believe, as we must believe, that the junior college is a unique institution. These elements of uniqueness will impinge on each area of our concern. They will determine: what kinds of persons we seek, how these persons are deployed and utilized, what types of educational experiences will prepare the person for his work and for his effective growth after assignment, and what conditions must be met to bring each person to his full potential in the institution. And if there is any single task of the President that far overshadows all other tasks, it is, in my opinion, that of setting the stage so that every individual who is employed has the opportunity to achieve his full potential both in personal satisfaction and in service to the institution. None of us do this perfectly, but this is one goal of administrative organization and work with our faculty towards which we must work very diligently.

May we now turn our attention to recruitment and selection. To be sure, the junior colleges share with other educational institutions at all levels, a critical shallowness in the pool of qualified personnel. I started to use the term here "the water level is low" but I didn't think that water level perhaps was too good an analogy. In our desperation to staff our colleges -- and it does sometimes border almost on desperation -- we are increasing the scarcity, through our stepped-up pace of competitive biddings and of canvassing of our existing resources. We decry this, both in principle and in practice, but we are doing little to identify recruitment methods which bring new people into the profession. After a study of faculty recruitment techniques used by thirty-six deans and presidents throughout the country, Kevin P. Bunnell reported in the April, 1960, issue of THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD, that the methods of recruitment which are being used by these thirty-six deans and presidents, "are substantially those employed by college administrators for the past fifty years." We still, in this area evidently, are driving about a 1910 model. Surely if we are to be spared a continuation of the present practice of unrestricted bidding, and even piracy, we must assume the responsibility for replenishing the resource pool. This can be done. It is ridiculous for us to say that it cannot be done. And certainly, if it can be done, it must be done.

Philip H. Coombs, in a statement to be found in CURRENT ISSUES OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR 1957, states that the people most competent to identify and encourage tomorrow's teachers are today's teachers. "They know best what to look for in young people and they alone," says Mr. Coombs, "can convey a true picture of the deep rewards of teaching. Thus, the primary job of recruitment must be done by our faculty members." It really is, I think, rather a shame, having youngsters in school working with teachers over such a long period of time as we do in our educational structure from the elementary schools through our colleges, that we have done such a poor job as teachers of selling these youngsters on the rewards of teaching and on teaching as a career. In fact, I have known some faculty who have advised bright students not to go into teaching. Now, there may be some individual instances in which, regardless of the degree of intellect, an individual should be advised not to go into teaching. But it is certainly unpardonable, that faculty members should think of their own profession in such a light that they would discourage their better students from choosing it as a profession. Leland Metzger, in his publication, THE JUNIOR COLLEGE: PROGRESS AND PROSPECT notes that twenty-seven percent of junior college teachers and administrators, responding to the study which he made on junior college recruitment, had once attended a junior college. This is certainly heartening. Here in our own state we point our finger again and again to the fact that many of our junior college teachers and leaders are junior college products. The two most outstanding examples of this, perhaps, are Dr. Jim Wattenbarger and Dr. Lee Henderson, who are our leaders at the level of the State Department of Education in the junior college movement here in Florida; both of whom are junior college products. Metzger observed that this figure, twenty-seven percent (which is surprisingly high in view of the relatively small number of college graduates who could have attended junior college during the time that the present generation of teachers were in training) suggests "that the long term recruitment of junior college teachers may well begin with the present generation of junior college students." Now I want to address these specific questions to my institution and to each of us, "Are we doing anything in a conscious way — in a planned way — to further this great potential source of future junior college teachers and administrators ?" And when I use teachers and administrators, I am really thinking throughout this paper of the entire gamut of what we call in Florida, certificated personnel, or our professional personnel.

Satisfactory solution to our recruitment problem, will according to Professor Earl W. Anderson, in CURRENT ISSUES OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN 1957, depend upon: (1) the attractiveness of college teaching to present and prospective teachers: Obviously, if it is not attractive to the present core of teachers we have, they are not going to transmit the attractiveness which it should have to those with whom they come in contact. (2) effective programs of preparation, orientation and professional growth for college teachers. I'll have more to say about that one later (3) adequate financial assistance for many prospects. This is your scholarship, your loan programs and the like which will encourage more teachers to go into this. (4) effective encouragement to qualified youth to prepare for teaching in higher education.

This relates to number one. (5) the employement as teachers in our institutions of qualified individuals who have not been given consideration before, either because of race or color or sex, or age or nepotism regulations. More and more, I am sure, we are moving into these heretofore untapped areas of personnel. In my institution we have profited greatly from some of the sources of retired personnel who are able and alert and active and aggressive. We have profited, too, from using on a part-time basis many individuals of quality who are engaged in full-time occupations outside the work of education. (6) various methods of increasing the student-teacher ratio. I am not sure to what extent this can help in the proper staffing of our institutions. That is the use of TV and other media, and some authorities that I have read, even put in here an independent study plan. I doubt if independent study plans, properly used, are really going to increase your student-teacher ratio, though we might get better utilization of the particular abilities of our staff. At present, junior college administrative and teaching personnel are recruited principally from other junior colleges, from high schools, from senior colleges and universities, and from retired persons -- both military and civilian -- from industry and business (more often part-time than full-time) and from a trickle now coming through the graduate training programs -- graduate teacher-education and administrative-training programs. The extent to which these sources are used will depend upon the philosophy of the administration, the geographic location of the college, and the nature of the course and the programs in the college. Some junior college administrators, for example, look with great disfavor on recruiting from high school staffs. Others fear the recruit from the four-year colleges and universities, because these may hold concepts and methods not attuned to the junior college. In assessing these sources of staff, the junior college administrator will find much food for thought and many suggestions for action in the proceedings of the workshop on establishing junior colleges which was held this past year (1961) at the University of California in Los Angeles. Many of us have had the opportunity of reading from the proceedings of that workshop. In advising administrators participating in that workshop, the President of Orange Coast College suggests the need of variety in the background in recruiting a staff. "Don't hesitate," he said, "to take from twenty to twenty-five percent of your faculty from high schools, but, he cautions, "you must also have experienced junior college people and some from four-year institutions." From the proceedings of this California workshop we are reminded of three of the disadvantages of recruiting our personnel from the high school staff: first, the junior college students (those students who come to the junior college and the community itself) may regard the junior college as "just an extension of the high school" if it is too heavily staffed from high school sources; secondly, friction may develop with the high school principal whose teachers are "stolen"; three, many high school teachers do not have the proper conception of a junior college, that is, no sympathy with the open door policy.

In locating suitable candidates for positions, John Dale Russell and Floyd W. Reeves write, (they weren't writing just about junior colleges, but I rather expect it would apply here as well) "The better institutions utilize the services of placement bureaus of colleges and universities, the placement bureaus of the AAUP, contacts through learned societies and commercial agencies. Selection only or largely from among candidates making direct application is characteristic of weaker institutions of higher learning." And I am sure this is true again in the practice of all of us. While we do not overlook those candidates who come to us through direct application, we are more likely to exhaust other more direct and more intimate means available to us in the recruitment of personnel. This is in consonance with a practice I expect most of us would like to follow, namely, that "the job should seek the person rather than the reverse." This is a concept that I certainly hold. When a job is vacant and we have the dimension of that job, when we know the sorts of abilities that we think are required to fill that job, then we should go after that person. Of course, the method of going after him might be subject to considerable discussion. The selection of staff, both administrative and teaching, is best done when it involves the cooperative participation of appropriate individuals on the faculty.

Turning now from recruitment to selection itself. The primary responsibility must repose, in my opinion, in the office of first level supervision over the position being filled. An illustration or two may clarify and reinforce this statement. Let us say for example, that the position that we are going to fill is a teaching position in the department of fine arts of the division of humanities. The head of the department of fine arts, preferably in consultation with his staff, identifies the characteristics of the person desired. He does this in relation to the existing departmental abilities. Having done this, he turns to his sources of supply, or sources of assistance. First, he would use the more intimate and direct ones, such as assessing those individuals whom he knows in his own field who have the abilities required and who might be receptive to an invitation. Even if these individuals can't be secured, they may suggest someone else. If he doesn't fill the position from this more intimate source, he would possibly consult his major professor of the institution from which he was graduated. The head of the department in search of the right individual to fill a position would begin, then, with his more intimate and direct sources and work through the entire range of sources until he "identified his man."

Having involved his staff and his immediate superior, he is ready to initiate the recommendation of appointment. This, of course, then should go sequentially through the higher echelons of administration. The important considerations I am trying to pinpoint here are: first, that the process of selection should involve appropriate persons in the college, and second, that the recommendation of appointment should be initiated at the level of immediate supervision.

Now let us turn to deployment and utilization. The faculty member having been appointed certainly comes to his position with enthusiasm and confidence. If this were not true it would be difficult to comprehend his acceptance of the position. It is compelling that everything be done to create an institutional environment in which the new staff member will grow in enthusiasm, in confidence and in service. Whether his abilities will be translated into dedicated and satisfying service or whether they become dissipated and frittered away, will depend in very large measure upon the orientation he receives upon arrival, upon his deployment and his subsequent opportunity to do the things he feels most competent to do and in which he feels he is flexing his strength.

Each appointee has a primary job to do. He is brought there for a purpose; for a particular job. The greatest degree of satisfaction to the individual, and the greatest contribution to the institution from this individual, will come when this primary job is clearly delineated, defined and thoroughly understood. Often we fall short on this. Most professional persons ask but little more than an opportunity to do the job which they feel is pre-eminently their job to do. Dissipate their energies through demands which they feel inconsequential and which distract them from their main devotion, and the path is being made that will surely lead to personnel discontent, if not disaster. John W. Gustad, in a recent study made for the New England Board of Higher Education concludes: "To a very considerable extent, faculty personnel problems arise from the fact that most faculty members are prevented from doing what they are interested in and what they are trying to do." Much of the same is true for administrators.

This does not deny that most individuals possess abilities and interests for tasks outside their main preoccupation, or in addition to their main assignment — abilities and interests which will be happily given in service to the institution in assignments other than that for which the individual was employed. The important caution here, however, is to determine that secondary assignments in the institution are clearly within the individual's ability and interests, and do not appear to the staff member to distract unduly from his primary work.

Committee assignments comprise perhaps the greatest percent of these so-called secondary assignments of staff members. Much has been said pro and con regarding the use of faculty committees. It is evident that the last word has not been spoken nor will it be spoken here, on faculty committees. The question is not a simple: "to be or not to be"; "shall we have faculty committees or shall we not have faculty committees." Of course, we are going to have faculty committees. We must identify those institutional problems which yield best to faculty committee action and in which the faculty is likely to feel personally identified. This can be a very critical point in acceptance -- genuine acceptance — on the part of faculty members on committees. Lloyd S. Whitburn writes, "It is not universally true that men seek to be relieved of assignments to committees, sometimes I think we get the idea that this is true. Committee assignment may appear to the member a mark of competence and an indication that he is a person of importance in the institution. And this can truly be. Committee activity can give the faculty members a feeling of participation in a larger enterprise." On the other hand, Dr. Gustad reports, "that of faculty members at the Ohio State University who were asked how their effectiveness was being reduced below the optimum, one-third of them replied, that too much time was taken by committee assignments. And interestingly enough, we find almost the identical reaction by a study at the junior college level in which one-third of the faculty indicated that it was overloaded with committee assignments.

Many would agree with Dickhoff, who wrote in his publication, WHAT IS THE DOMAIN OF THE FACULTY IN OUR EXPANDING COLLEGES?, (Harpers 1956) "If the instructor is too busy with scholarship and teaching to take part in committee, department or faculty deliberation, he loses sight of the over-all aims of his college and he takes too narrow a view of his function." Dr. Franklin Johnson, President of Jacksonville University, in an address to which I referred earlier today, has some observations which are significant to our concern here. I quote from his address. "Such activities as public relations, placement, fund raising, and purchasing for which the faculty usually has no time, experience or interest, are understood to be, rather genuinely, administrative. Then there is the area in which agreement by both faculty and administration ideally should determine the policy. I speak here of such matters as curriculum planning, academic organization, student affairs, guidance, counseling, etc. In such areas as these in the government of a university, and to be sure, of a junior college, it seems to me that faculty committees have a wide advisory role."

James Kenneth Mumford, writing in the 36th volume of COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY (1960) has the following significant suggestions regarding faculty committees which, in our consideration for the wise deployment and utilization of our staff, I think, has significance for us. "As a mutual body to hear evidence and render a decision, as a device for formulating recommendations or legislation, as a problem solving or advisory group, or as a means for disseminating information and building morale through participating, in these ways the faculty committee still flourishes. It is true that some of the administrative tasks formerly performed by professors in their spare time are now handled by administrative officers, but the committee still lingers in the background to advise and guide the executive." In a study reported in the 1959 JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL, Dr. Eckhart indicated that forty percent of the junior college faculty questioned in his particular study stated that they desired no change in their time distribution, with the greatest portion of their time, of course, being given to teaching. But about a third of these junior college faculty members did feel that they would prefer a reduction in time spent on committee assignments and administrative service. So look to your own practice in your own institution in this.

And now, if we may turn just briefly to pre-service and in-service preparation. In our discussion of recruitment and selection of junior college personnel we were conscious of the lack of pre-service education which would furnish us with any significant input of persons adequately prepared for administrative or teaching positions in our junior colleges. Leland Metzger reinforces this fact in the following words: "The education for teachers and counselors for the two-year college will not be accomplished easily, either qualitatively or quantitatively. One of the difficulties," he continues, "will be to find and prepare teachers whose image of themselves as staff members of a two-year college is in harmony with the distinctive purposes of this type of college rather than with some other type of college." And to this we have already paid our respects.

Dr. Gordon Pyle, Dean of Academic Studies in the Dade County Junior College, in a letter to the Dean of Academic Affairs of the University of Florida, expresses his concern for a different sort of pre-service teacher education if we are going to have a supply of adequately trained teachers in our junior colleges. From his letter I read two paragraphs.

> "Another matter of primary importance is the proper staffing of a junior college. There are twenty-four of these institutions in the state at present, with more to come. At Dade County Junior College we employed forty-five members in the academic division the first year, and we are employing between sixty-five and seventy new ones for the second year. Since the main emphasis in the junior college is teaching, rather than research, a teacher whose preparation and orientation are in this direction will serve us best. We have searched far and wide to find faculty members who possess adequate depth and breadth for teaching at the junior college level. In our staffing we have tried to find persons who have depth in two subjects of a broad field, such as history and political science within the social science area. This kind of preparation gives teachers enough depth to teach well at the junior college level and sufficient breadth to initiate some flexibility in assignment without having to have instructors teach courses for which they are inadequately prepared.
>
> In our staffing, we have in some instances had to draw the better teachers in the high school system, and this, correspondingly, weakens the high school. In other instances we have had to take on people whose preparation would better qualify them for university teaching, particularly graduate level teaching. This is to say that they have a tremendous depth of preparation in a single area, or, are research oriented. A person who is prepared in depth, or whose basic orientation is toward research is not the proper kind of faculty member for a junior college. Nevertheless, we are sometimes forced to take them. What is needed is a graduate program which prepares candidates for the Master's and Doctor's degrees or the equivalents thereof, but who are prepared with a dual major within a broad field. These persons should also have some intern experience in the Master's and Doctoral program. They should, in my opinion, teach at least one full semester of a general education or introductory course as a part of their required program of preparation. If the University of Florida, or any other University in this state, were to initiate such a program which would turn out graduates holding Master's and Doctor's degrees, I am sure the graduates would find immediate and satisfying employment."

In November, 1960, issue of THE JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL, Dr. James Reynolds, its editor, points up the unique nature of the teaching responsibilities of junior college faculties, which in turn demand a unique program of pre-service education. Four unique aspects of these teaching responsibilities presented by Dr. Reynolds are: (1) The introductory and general education nature of the academic program in junior colleges requires teachers who have depth of understanding in several subject matter fields as contrasted to the narrower specialization that characterizes the preparation in many of our four-year colleges and institutions. (2) The wider ranges of abilities, aptitudes, interests and goals of the junior college students require greater proficiency by the faculty in the matter of instruction (3) The continued and even increased incidence of vocational and technical education in junior colleges requires teachers for these classes and teachers of academic classes who understand and appreciate the importance of such non-academic programs. (4) The increasing importance of counseling and guidance, which will occur in junior colleges require faculty members who can contribute more effectively to such areas.

The problem of securing adequately prepared junior college teachers would be greatly simplified in future years if programs designed specifically to prepare junior college administrators could be extended to prepare junior college teachers as well. Perhaps we can get Foundations' support for establishing such programs, extending what we are beginning to do now in leadership training programs for administrators, to prepare junior college teachers as well. The beginnings are in sight as we have indicated earlier. But until these are more adequately met, our personnel staffing problems are going to be acute. Ralph Tyler sympathizes with us on this in some remarks he made as reported in the November, 1960, issue of THE JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL, when he states, "that meeting the teaching obligations of the junior college is one of the most difficult ones in American education today. You have no adequate traditions to guide you, you cannot obtain staff members already fully prepared to discharge this responsibility." So long as this condition persists, we must turn to the only place we can turn to help alleviate this situation immediately, to our best alternative, that of in-service teacher education programs designed to improve the quality of insturction already available. This is being done by most junior colleges in various ways. Self-study programs leading towards accreditation (this has been a tremendous source of encouragement to us in in-service teacher education programs); on-campus courses in which all faculty members are involved; the Odessa plan of individual study on the part of its instructors with which many of you are familiar.

I want to turn for just one moment or two to the question of morale. I do this more in terms of raising the question which you may want to discuss in your sectional meetings, rather than to offer adequate treatment of it here. I have already expressed my belief that if you give an individual (who is adequately trained for a job and who brings enthusiasm and confidence to that job) an environment in which he feels that he is making a significant contribution to the institution, he will gain great satisfaction from his work. This is the single greatest means, in my opinion, of achieving faculty morale -- giving the person the opportunity to do the job he wants to do. This immediately, of course, brings into play many facets of the total picture -- administrative-faculty relationships, organization, a real belief of colleague status of all persons on this faculty, etc.

In the last analysis, morale, like happiness, is something that happens in us and not something that happens to us.

A PROPOSAL FOR A LONG-RANGE PROJECT TO STUDY JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION IN THE SOUTHEASTERN UNITED STATES

by W. Hugh Stickler*
Professor and Head, Department of Higher Education and
Director, Office of Institutional Research and Service
Florida State University

This has been a good conference. Through it we have started something of great importance to all of us — something we shall not want to see come to an end.

I am sure all of you know this conference and the many other activities which together constitute the Southeastern Regional Junior College Leadership Program have been made possible through a grant of funds from the Kellogg Foundation. We are all grateful for this grant of money to get this project going. But we should realize now that the Kellogg funds will run out on August 31, 1964. After that if this project is to continue we must on our own initiative find other means to support it. It is perhaps not too early to begin thinking now about that date in the future when the Kellogg funds will have been exhausted. It is for this reason that I should like to make a proposal for your consideration.

I should like to begin by describing another joint educational project in another section of the country for I feel there is a parallel between it and what we might do here among the junior colleges of the southeast. I refer to the North Central Association Study on Liberal Arts Education.

In 1938 the liberal arts colleges of the North Central Association faced a mutual problem. (Their problem at the time happened to be concerned with the training of secondary school teachers in liberal arts colleges, but their particular problem is of little or no concern here. Moreover, the NCA project has since branched out to include many other education concerns.) After some preliminary work primarily on the part of Dr. Russell M. Cooper, then at a midwestern institution but now Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at the University of South Florida, a small grant of foundation money was obtained. The work got underway on a modest scale. A few years later another small grant was forthcoming. Soon the project became self supporting.

Originally there were 38 liberal arts colleges cooperating in the project. After the project became self supporting the number of schools was expanded. Now more than 20 years later there are more than 80 institutions in the study and it is moving along with full force and vigor and unmitigated interest. I believe you will be interested in the manner in which the project operates.

The purposes of the NCA study make clear the nature of the project. There are nine of these purposes as follow:

1. To provide an opportunity for inter-institutional cooperation among liberal arts colleges on a voluntary basis.
2. To encourage and to assist member colleges in organizing and executing self-studies.
3. To sponsor institutional research leading to improvement in programs and teaching in the member colleges.
4. To promote fact finding and inquiry as methods of program planning and curricular and administrative revision.
5. To provide continuing stimulation to participating institutions and indirectly to non-member colleges through inter-collegiate regional conferences.
6. To provide a consultant service to member and non-member institutions.
7. To organize and conduct regional conferences on problems in higher education for college teachers who ordinarily attend meetings only in their professional fields.
8. To provide opportunities for in-service development of liberal arts college teachers.
9. To work toward closer cooperative relations among all types of colleges.

---

*In the preparation of this paper the author has drawn heavily from a mimeographed document entitled North Central Association Study on Liberal Arts Education: Its Organization, Purposes, Policies, Opportunities, and Obligations.

As you see, the NCA project has a broad approach. In the more than 20 years of the existence of this project a full program of activities has been developed.

It has been my good fortune to know personally all of the directors of the NCA project, so I have known about its provisions almost from the beginning. Then a few years ago I was asked to work intensively for a month in a project workshop held at the University of Minnesota. The longer I have known this project the greater has grown my admiration and respect for it. I now emerge with two convictions: first, the project is a splendid thing in itself; and, second, the south greatly needs something like it at the liberal arts college and/or junior college level. I am not proposing that our junior college problems here in the south are the same as the liberal ars college problems in the North Central Association, but I am suggesting that there may be a parallel in principles which potentially portends good things for the institutions represented by those of us assembled in this conference today and other institutions similar to those we represent.

Let us turn now to the kinds of services requested by and provided for the participating schools. There are ten of them:

1. Workshops in Higher Education. Each summer two workshops are conducted, each of four week duration. The one at the University of Minnesota is traditionally held in late June and early July while the one held at Michigan State University is held in August. These conferences provide leadership, resources, and leisure necessary for college teachers to concentrate on some problem of higher education of concern to them and their institution. They also provide the means by which participants can consider the problems of education more broadly than is possible under the stress of full work schedules during the academic year.

2. Presidents' Workshop. To provide a similar kind of experience for college presidents, a three day conference or workshop is held in connection with the annual meeting of the North Central Association. These meetings provide provocative consultants and an opportunity for college leaders to consider mutual problems and to discuss workable solutions to them.

3. Deans' Workshop. This workshop is designed to meet purposes for college deans similar to those being met for the presidents. The workshop is held concurrently with the presidents' workshop.

4. Central Office. The central office of the project is located in East Lansing, Michigan and consists of the part-time director and a part-time secretary. This office attempts to coordinate the various study activities, maintains the files of the project, seeks to provide leadership for new ventures and issues a monthly News Bulletin during the academic year.

5. Coordinators. A vital service of the project is to provide a visit of a resource person to each participating campus once each year. These visits are made by the director or one of the coordinators. The coordinators are mature faculty members or administrators from schools in the study. They attempt to provide whatever help they can in a one day visit and serve as the liaison between the schools they visit and the central office of the project. For some schools expert consultants may be requested instead of one of the regular coordinators.

6. The North Central News Bulletin. Once each month during the academic year the New Bulletin is published containing items of interest about the participating schools, descriptions of studies in progress, reports about new developments in higher education and statements designed to stimulate thought. It is distributed to faculty and administrators in the study and to all former participants in the workshops.

7. North Central Packets. Accompanying the News Bulletin each month is a collection of bulletins, reprints, and other materials likely to be of some significance to teachers in liberal arts colleges. These packets are usually sent to the person charged with coordinating study activities on each campus — frequently the person who attended the workshop the previous summer.

8. Library and Resource Files. A collection of books and pamphlet materials dealing with problems of higher education is maintained at the University of Minnesota. Items from this collection are available on loan to anyone involved in the study. The entire file and library is used in each workshop.

9. Regional Conferences. The North Central Study cooperates with various regional

groups in sponsoring conferences on higher education. Typically two to three such meetings are held each year and are so organized as to provide direct assistance for teachers struggling with practical problems. Outstanding leaders in education are featured and ample opportunity provided for discussion groups to explore the ideas they bring.

10. Research. The project is just now entering a venture of sponsoring cooperative research on a regional basis. This phase of the project seems to hold great promise for success and long-range usefulness.

Certain far-reaching principles govern the conduct of the NCA project. These principles have been reaffirmed each time they have been re-studied. They are as follows:

1. Local Autonomy. The project is in no sense a supervisory organization. It provides the machinery by which colleges can study their own problems and can communicate with other institutions about common concerns.

2. Faculty Involvement. The project has operated on the assumption that meaningful change can come about on a college campus only in the degree to which faculties are active participants. The many services of the project are designed to facilitate faculty involvement.

3. Institutional Cooperation. The project assumes that greater progress is possible if institutions pool their resources, their findings, and their insights. Cooperation is, therefore, a keystone in the structure of the North Central project.

4. Broad Interpretation of Educational Problems. From its inception the project has considered the problems of liberal arts education to be highly interrelated. Thus a concern over teacher training could well result in a study of faculty counseling and an inquiry in the humanities involve a study of student cost. The entire range of problems is thus the province of this project.

5. Workshop Participants. Experience has shown the tremendous significance of workshop attendance in the training of college teachers. It has been the policy of the project to encourage use of such people in place of responsibility for educational planning on each campus.

To insure effectiveness with respect to each facet of the program of the North Central Study, institutions participating are asked to agree to certain conditions. These are:

1. To send at least one representative to either one of the North Central Workshops in Higher Education.
2. To organize and maintain a self-study project.
3. To prepare an annual report of findings from the self-study and to make this available to the central office of the project.
4. To share its findings, documents developed, and insights gained with other colleges through the media of the News Bulletin, packets, or other relevant means.
5. To contribute $200.00 per year toward the support of the program.

As I have indicated, the project through the years has been supported in part by foundation grants but principally by the contributions of the colleges engaged in the study. At present the annual fee of $200 defrays almost the entire cost of the operations which are conducted primarily through a part-time director and seven coordinators who perform their duties without release of time from their institutions.

In preparing for these remarks I wrote a letter to Dr. John X. Jamrich, present director of the NCA project. His reply contains two sentences which I believe will interest you: "In my judgment the most significant activities of the project are the summer workshops, the annual workshops for deans and presidents, the publication of the Bulletin, and the carrying on of the cooperative research activities. As of this moment, my judgment is that the project continues to have ample inertia to carry it forward successfully for many years to come."

I also wrote to Dr. Russell M. Cooper, the person who perhaps was responsible more than any other single individual for getting the NCA project started. Among other things in his letter of reply he says, "Working with the colleges of the middle west has been a most gratifying experience for me. And it would be wonderful if something of the same sort could be inaugurated in the south."

I have described the NCA project at some length in the belief that it holds implications for the junior colleges of the south. Cannot we begin to think now beyond the time when the Kellogg grant funds run out and see if there is something akin to the NCA project which can be developed and made appropriate to function vitally in the leves of the junior colleges of the south? If we elect to go forward with a project of this kind I feel sure we have the resources and personnel with which to do a good job. Both Dr. Russell M. Cooper and Dr. Lewis B. Mayhew (a later director of the NCA project) are now at the University of South Florida; I feel certain that both would be glad to volunteer their services. And those of us at the University of Florida and at the Florida State University will be glad to do whatever we can to help.

We can made these junior colleges in the south as good as we want them to be. In the immortal words of Pogo, "We have met the enemy and he is us"!. If a project such as I have been describing will help us improve our operations in the long pull, I invite you to consider it. In fact, I make it as a proposal. You are not asked to make a decision today or next week or next month. But if the idea has any merit we may want to talk about it at this conference when it meets again next year.

NOTE. Soon after this address was made Dr. Jamrich, because of a new assignment of responsibility at Michigan State University, found it necessary to resign as Director of the NCA Study of Liberal Arts Education. As of the fall of 1961 the Director is Dr. Allan O. Pfnister and, as a convenience to Dr. Pfnister, the central office of the project has been moved to the campus of the University of Michigan. But the work of the project moves ahead with full force and vigor.

A LOOK BACKWARD OVER THE WEEK'S ACTIVITIES AND A LOOK FORWARD

by B. Lamar Johnson
Professor of Higher Education
University of California, Los Angeles

President Reitz, Vice President Philpott, members of the Institute. Before I begin my remarks, I wish to call your attention to the presence here of a friend and former colleague of mine at Stephens College. He later was at the University of Denver and is now living in Gainesville. Many of you know Dr. Roy Ivan Johnson. Roy Ivan, will you stand, please?

A number of years ago a small, elderly woman entered a dry goods store in the Middle West. She asked the clerk who came to wait on her for a red-checkered shawl. It so happened that there were no red-checkered shawls in stock, and yet the salesman didn't want to miss a sale. He did some rapid thinking and suddenly remembered a group of red-checkered table cloths, one of which he refolded and sold as a shawl.

The manager of the store observed what had happened and was angry. Since he had noted the occurrance just as the woman was leaving, he could do nothing except talk to the salesman. The proprietor accordingly told the salesman, "We are not going to have our customers treated this way. As a matter of fact, unless you can find biblical justification for what you just did by tomorrow morning, you are fired!"

The salesman went home and read his Bible, as he hadn't studied it for years. He read it all night. About five o'clock in the morning he thought he found what he was looking for. He got a few winks of sleep and went to work. When his employer approached to give him his final check, the salesman said, "Now wait a minute. We had an agreement that if I found biblical justification for what I did, that I might keep my position."

"Well, that's true," said the manager, "but of of course, you didn't."

"Oh yes, but of course, I did." siad the salesman.

The manager was quite puzzled but finally inquired "Well, what is the justification?"

Came the reply, "She was a stranger, and I took her in."

On Monday I came here a stranger and, in the very finest sense of the word, you have "taken me in". It has been a personal and a professional pleasure for me to be here.

My remarks this afternoon are divided into four parts. First, I shall comment on five impressions I have of this institute. Second, I should like to suggest five conclusions which I reached as a result of the Institute sessions. Third, I shall comment on a basic characteristic of the junior college which has been neglected at this particular Institute, and finally, I shall make a few comments on a broad goal to which I believe we are all committed.

A. Five Impressions

I shall now refer to five personal impressions. The first is this: I feel at home here. I have commented on the warmth of your welcome. I am also thinking of warmth in terms of heat. Those of you who have lived in Missouri, have been reminded of some summers there. Summers can also be hot at the University of Minnesota and the University of Chicago. You simply don't have a monopoly on heat in Florida. I might likewise refer to the warmth of your welcome from the point of view of the problems with which you are dealing here. They are problems on which we in California are also working and with which we are concerned. Repeatedly during this last week I have said to myself, "Well, this is just where you left home, Lamar." Both you and we are, for example, working on problems associated with the transferring junior college courses to senior institutions, matters of finance, and faculty participation in guidance.

Second, I am impressed with the fact that at this Institute are represented widely varied junior colleges: institutions from different states, urban and rural, large and small, public and private. This is in tradition of Kellogg Junior College Administration programs. These programs are not planned for private junior colleges; they are not planned for public junior colleges; they are planned for all junior colleges. I congratulate the University of Florida and Florida State University in so effectively carrying out the intent of the foundation grants in the wide involvement of all types of junior colleges. I urge of all of you to take advantage of the resources which you have in these universities.

Third, I have been impressed with the essential unity of the junior college movement. Dr.

Wimpress has, on several occasions, as a member of the Commission on Administration of The American Association of Junior Colleges, pointed out the fact that the problems of the private junior college and those of the public junior college are essentially identical -- the major difference being the different sources of income. In our recent workshop at UCLA, Dr. John Lombardi, Chairman of the Commission on Administration, took this same point of view as he pointed to the essential unity of junior colleges. In his comments he was particularly referring (he being president of one of the largest, if not the largest, junior college in the country) to basic similarity of problems in large and small institutions. In magnitude, different; in principles, similar. Dr. Wimpress, I congratulate you and your associates on the Commission on Administration for the recognition and leadership that you are giving to unification within the junior college movement.

Fourth, I am impressed with the size of the group in attendance at this Institute and with the quality of leadership here present. This summer there have been conferences, institutes, workshops at Columbia University, in Michigan, in Texas, in California, and here. It has been my pleasure to be at two workshops other than this one: one at Berkely where I was consultant, and the one at UCLA of which I was a director. To the best of my knowledge, this is the largest Institute or workshop yet held under the Kellogg Leadership Program. You also have here a notably high representation of Presidents, chief administrators. The quality of your leadership augers well for the junior college movement.

I am, however, reminded of the fact with the expansion of the junior colleges in the years that lie ahead, we are going to need a vastly increased number of admistrators in our junior colleges. Such studies as have been made indicate that it is impossible, statistically, to identify administrative talent ahead of time. The studies do reveal, however, that the best criterion which we have is the judgment of a successful administrator, who, observing colleagues on his staff, may be able to point a finger here or point a finger there and say, "Here is a man who appears to have potential administrative leadership." I urge those of you who are presidents to give serious thought to this question. Who is the man or the woman on your staff who is most likely to be highly qualified for junior college administrative leadership? As you identify these people, I suggest that you keep in mind the opportunities available to them and to you in your Florida program on junior college administration.

Fifth, I am impressed with the effective organization and conduct of this institute. The team approach offers great promise. You as teams are returning to your colleges to work on plans and developments which you have initiated or carried forward here. This has been a practical workshop. It was set up for that purpose. It has been directly concerned with specific problems and opportunities in your colleges. And of course as we come to the final session, we all recognize is an unfinished workshop. You will be working next year and one year from now will be returning to report your findings and experiences. We have also been impressed at this workshop with the extent to which the resources of participating universities have been made and will be made available to you. During the next college year you are to be visited by one or more representatives of one of the universities. I recall hearing a conversation one of you had with either Bob or Ray. As he came to an understanding of your problem, he said, "Well, you know, I think that for your work on this we should make Professor so-and-so available to you for consultation and assistance." The resources of the universities can be of tremendous value to you. Incidentally, in California where we have three universities working together, we are finding that it is fine for university faculty groups to have the experience of working together on matters of common concern, interest and need. I know that you, as junior college leaders, recognize the high degree of cooperation that you are seeing exhibited in this workshop and in other activities of the Florida program. This Institute has been wisely conceived and effectively organized. It has been conducted in a notable spirit of cooperation and good will. I want to congratulate Dr. Wiegman and Dr. Schultz on a job well done. I too, congratulate all of you on your good fortune in having here to work with you these outstanding scholars and leaders in the junior college movement, men who are recognized not only in the Southeastern states, but nationally. Instead of simply giving them a hand while they sit, how would you like to have them stand? Ray and Bob. . . . . We all admire and are indebted to both of you.

B. Five Conclusions

And now I suggest five conclusions that seem to me to emerge from this workshop.

First, the establishment and acceptance of purposes is essential to all aspects of junior college administration and operation. This is a basic principle of administration. If this institute has had a single theme, I would say that it has been its emphasis upon (a) the basic and central importance of establishing purposes, clearly, specifically, well-defined, and (b) the acceptance of those purposes by the staff committed to working toward their achievement. From Dr. Johns' opening address, through every address at this conference (concerning fund raising, student personnel, institutional research, use of library, and faculty personnel) purposes have been stressed. Every efficient organization, whether it has a large organization or a unit within an organization, must have unity of purpose. I urge upon you the importance of establishing the purpose of the study on which you are to work this next year. Although I have not seen reports of your plans, on the basis of such experience as I have had in similar ventures I suggested that in all likelihood you will need to work on a more specific statement of the purpose of your project. Your university consultants will undoubtedly be of assistance in identifying purposes which you may not have identified.

Second, the effectiveness of administration is advanced when members of a staff have similar images of the functions and responsibilities of various administrative positions. Imagine the chaos that can, and too often does, exist when the Dean of Instruction has one image of his responsibilities, the President a second image, and division and department chairmen still other images. We are working toward a situation in which those in each of these positions have similar images of the respective positions. As I have visited with you I have been impressed with the emphasis that you are giving to defining and setting up job specifications. In Florida Dr. Wattenbarger and Dr. Henderson are giving you leadership in this important area.

Third, student personnel service is notably, and I would say uniquely, important in the junior college. Institutions which are open door colleges obviously have heterogenous student bodies, with wide ranges and types of abilities. We find that from two-thirds to three-fourths of the students entering junior college report their plans to transfer to senior institutions. You and I know, however, that national studies show that only from one-fourth to one-third actually continue their education beyond junior college graduation. In his volume, THE OPEN DOOR COLLEGE, Burton Clark identified what he designates as the "cooling off" function of the junior college, a term which he borrows from the literature of psychiatry and from the literature of gambling. He points out that the gambler, or the confidence man, who has just fleeced a victim, upon occasion faces the responsibility of leading the victim to realize the reality of the situation in which he finds himself. In other words, "to realize the reality of his fleecedness". Clark suggests that the junior college, the open door college, has somewhat this same responsibility to students; a responsibility to help them face the reality of the particular situation in which they find themselves. This, of course, requires highly effective guidance and counseling. I have here a fable entitled "The Animal School", that may not be unrelated to counseling and guidance written by Dr. G. M. Reavis.

Once upon a time the animals decided that they must do something heroic to meet the problems of the new world; so they organized a school. They adopted an activity curriculum consisting of running, climbing, swimming and flying. To make it easier to administer, all the animals took all the subjects. (No need for guidance there.) The duck was excellent in swimming, in fact, better than his instructor, but he made only passing grades in flying and was very poor in running. Since he was slow in running, he had to stay after school and drop swimming to practice running. This was kept up until his webbed feet were badly worn and he was only average in swimming. But average was acceptable in school so nobody worried about that, except the duck.

The rabbit started at the top of the class in running but had a nervous breakdown because of so much make-up in swimming. The squirrelwas excellent in climbing until he developed frustration in flying class where his teacher made him start from the ground up instead of from the tree-top down. He developed charlie-horses from over-exertion and got a C in climbing and and D in running. The eagle was a problem child and was disciplined severely. In the climbing class he beat all the others to the top of the tree, but insisted on using his own way to get there.

At the end of the year, an abnormal eel that could swim exceedingly well and also run, climb and fly a little had the highest average and was valedictorian. The prairie dogs stayed out of school and fought the tax levy because the administration would not add digging and burrowing to the curriculum. They apprenticed their child to a badger and later joined the groundhogs and gophers to start a successful private school.

My fifth conclusion is this: two heads are better than one. Another way of saying this is, a group is stronger than the sum of its component parts. Involvement has been stressed here throughout the week. And this has been not only by verbalization but by the very structure of the conference — your group discussions, for example. In a very real sense, administration largely consists of organizing a group to the end that its potential is released and its power focused upon the achievement of commonly accepted outcomes. This process is facilitated by giving status to each member of the group. We talk a lot about "status seekers". The really successful administrator is a "status giver". He communicates to individuals in the organization the realization, "You are important. What you are interested in matters to me. Your objectives are highly significant."

C. A Neglected Basic Characteristic of the Junior College

I have suggested five characteristics of this institute and a like number of conclusions. Now I turn to a basic characteristic of the junior college which has largely been neglected this week. I make this comment not as a criticism of the Institute. We have had a full week. I scarcely see how we could have crowded more into it. And it has all been important. Dr. Wimpress has pointed out, you can't do anything without money. Dr. Williams has explained you can't do anything without effective personnel. Dr. Johns has observed you can't do anything without organization. Dr. Hardee has asserted you really can't do anything without an effective student personnel program. I have suggested that institutional research and the effective utilization of the library can contribute notably to institutional development and improvement.

As I identify one item that has largely been neglected, I could not and would not propose the omission of any part of the program we have had. Rather I refer to this omission because I believe we should keep it in mind as we return to our home colleges.

As a matter of fact, of course, many matters of consequence have largely been neglected here. For example, I have heard few references to that favorite term of ours in junior college circles, "the late-bloomer". We have given comparatively little attention to the subject of the discussion and concept of excellence in American education, little to vocational education, and comparatively little to curriculum building. But none of these is what I have in mind.

Without detracting from the importance of any of the subject we have considered this week, I would like to suggest this: The junior college is basically and essentially a teaching institution. We have given little direct attention to the improvement of instruction. As we go to our home bases, I urge that we keep in mind and in focus, the importance of teaching, the improvement of instruction, and also the recognition and reward of effective teaching. I am not going to suggest how to do this in the few minutes that we have. I would, however, like to read from a letter that an instructor in a California junior college wrote to his President a few weeks ago:

> "Every instructor has heard again and again that successful teaching depends upon motivating his students. This statement has become a pedagogical cliche but no instructor is likely to deny its truth. A teacher is working at his art week in and week out. Nobody says anything to him about his work because it is assumed he is doing his job, and he is. The same percentage of students continue to pass his courses, his reputation among students remains about the same, his hair turns gray or disappears, a few more wrinkles appear each year, and annually his bifocals become stronger. Everyone is satisfied, he's a successful teacher and is considered to be a credit to his college. But he knows, whenever he thinks about it, that he is bored. Bored stiff. Teachers are expected to motivate their students, but who in the wide world, is expected to motivate the teachers. Here is an area of activity that has been shamefully neglected."

Just shortly after getting this letter, I was talking with a veteran instructor in a junior college of California. He has been teaching for some thirty years, and he made this remark to me. "In my years in teaching at no time have I had an administrator come to me and say 'George, is there anything that I can do to help you?'" I urge the importance of instruction; I urege the importance of being status givers; I urge the importance of the administrator as a helper to the teacher.

D. A Broader Goal

You and I have been discussing matters of immediate concern to us; matters of importance that are before us at present. This has been a practical conference. In concluding my statement this afternoon I would like to suggest that as we work on our immediate concerns, we also be aware of some of our larger goals.

Last week I attended a conference on Goals for Americans[1], a report referred to earlier to in the week. President Eisenhower appointed a commission of distinguished Americans including Frank Pace, the former Secretary of the Army, Erwin D. Conham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor; James B. Conant; former Governor Darden of Virginia; General Alfred M. Gruenther; James R. Killian; and others. The report which these men issued makes excellent collateral reading for some of our basic courses in the social studies and is "grist for the mill" for faculty discussions. The report was — as planned — published between last November's election and the inauguration of President Kennedy.

---

[1] Goals for Americans. American Assembly, Columbia University, 1960.

As we studied Goals for Americans, we found that one of the important objectives listed is: "Two-year colleges should be roughly within commuting distance of every high school graduate, except in sparsely settled regions."

Let me repeat this — this is a national goal, a goal for Americans. "Two-year colleges should be roughly within commuting distance of every high school graduate, except in sparsely settled regions."

Now I did not say that. A committee of distinguished Americans made this statement.

The purposes on which you and I are working as we develop our colleges and our programs, are by no means restricted objectives. Ours is a national goal; ours is a nation-wide movement. During the last fifteen years we have had an average of fourteen new junior colleges in the U. S. each year.

It is not at all surprising in view of such statements as the one we just noted, that during the next few years we are expecting an average of twenty to thirty new junior colleges to be established in our nation each year.

However, ours is more than a national movement. As education is increasingly recognized as an essential component of our foreign policy, the junior college must play a role of increased importance. As I had an opportunity some months ago to visit schools and colleges in India and Pakistan, the Rhodesias and South Africa, the Middle East and Europe, the Philippines and Australia, I became increasingly aware of the fact that there are pressing educational needs in this world to which the American junior college can contribute. These include a need for education planned to meet community needs, a need for education in technical vocational areas.

In Rawalpindi, Pakistan, I saw a technical high school, beautifully equipped, a large building with a capacity for 600 with a total enrollment of 142. In the Philippines I saw a situation where there is an overabundance of lawyers. I visited a pineapple processing plant employing twenty-five hundred workers and the superintendent told me that two-thirds of the workers on his machines were lawyers. Now these are countries where there is a tremendous need for engineers and skilled workers. This is an area which is vastly neglected in education all over the world. Throughout the world there is a vast need for the education of adults. To the meeting of these needs the junior college can contribute. Ours is not simply just a national task, it's a world opportunity. I referred to last week's conference on Goals for Americans. This was a large conference with some eight hundred in attendance. Administrators and other educational leaders, mostly from the western states, but also from across the nation. It was a distinguished conference with speakers like Frank Pack, James R. Killian, and Senator Fulbright. The conference program was excellent. The conference itself was vital, but for me, the highlight of that conference was something that was not on the program. This had not been anticipated by the planning committee, as they had worked well over a year in advance of our conferences. On Tuesday evening of last week, right in the midst of this conference, the President of the United States, on a nation-wide television and radio address, reminded us that our nation is engaged in a cold war. He reminded us of the serious condition in which we find ourselves today and suggested that it may be necessary for use to make very real sacrifices to defend the goals for which we as Americans are committed. Listening to that address was a sober experience for all Americans, as it was a sobering experience for those of us at this conference. The situation in which we find ourselves today highlights goals that for us are not transitory, purposes to which the junior college is committed. In a democracy our goal is to educate each citizen to the highest level of his potential. Our human resources are, as we know, our greatest resources, in the cold war and in national development. We need all types of talents -- academic, mechanical, artistic, executive. This is true, not simply because we dare not neglect human resources, not simply because of the contribution that the citizen makes to the state, but in a democratic society we recognize human development as a goal and value in and of itself. The human personality is a sacred entity. To these we are, as a nation, committed. I would like to read the first two sentences of the book Goals for Americans. "The paramount goal for the United States was set long ago. It is to guard the rights of the individual, to insure his development and to enlarge his opportunities."

We must in American education and in our junior colleges, strive for excellence. And in striving for excellence we must never forget that American education has a clear mission to accomplish with every single child and young person who walks into a school or college. We must prepare all young people, whatever their talents, for the serious business of being free men and free women. This is our high purpose in America. This is our high purpose in the junior college as we contribute to individual development and welfare, to national and world propserity and peace.

KELLOGG JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATIVE TEAMS INSTITUTE

ALABAMA

The Marion Institute R. J. McDonald, Dean J. N. Cunningham, Exec. Vice-President	Marion

FLORIDA

Brevard Junior College John Easley, Registrar L. Nelson Donnell, Director of Tech.-Occupational Ed. M. T. Cheves, Evening Div. Coordinator	Cocoa
Carver Junior College James R. Greene, President Azie B. Horne, Sc. and Math. Instr. Miss Beecher B. Whisenant, Registrar-Hist. Instr.	Cocoa
Central Florida Junior College Joseph W. Fordyce, President Charles H. Hamblen, Jr., Vice-President, Dean of Students	Ocala
Collier Blocker Junior College Albert B. Williams, President Benjamin Mathis, Dean	Palatka
Dade County Junior College Kenneth Williams, President Gordon Pyle, Dean, Academic Studies L. W. Henderson, Dean, Adult Education and Spl. Degree Programs Theodore A. Koschler, Dean Tech. Education	Miami
Daytona Beach Junior College R. W. Whetstone, Dean M. G. Cox, Evening Director Roy F. Bergengren, Jr., President Leon Fordham, Director	Daytona Beach
Gulf Coast Junior College Richard Morley, President Harry N. Murphy, Dean of Student Personnel Services	Panama City
Hampton Junior College William H. Jackson, President Ralph P. Malone, Acting Dean	Ocala
Junior College of Broward County E. P. Lauderdale, Dean of Instruction Harvey B. Oates, Dir. of Admin. Services. Charles Harvey Miley, Dean of Students Rex C. Kidd, Dir-Comm. Svcs.	Ft. Lauderdale
Manatee Junior College Samuel R. Neel, Jr., President Wilson F. Wetzler, Dean of the College William G. Chambers, Librarian	Bradenton
North Florida Junior College Marshall Hamilton, President A. J. Hargrove, Registrar John E. Sands, Dean of Instruction	Madison

Palm Beach Junior College Harold C. Manor, President Paul W. Allison, Dean of Instr. Paul W. Graham, Dir. of Evening College Paul S. Glynn, Dean Stud. Pers.	Lake Worth
Pensacola Junior College Frederick T. Lenfestey, Dean of the College T. Felton Harrison, Dean of Basic Studies J. E. McCracken, Dean of Technical & Specialized Ed. Merrill Symonds, Dean of the Evening College	Pensacola
St. Johns River Junior College B. R. Tilley, President Edwin C. Price, Dean of Instruction Robert A. Schreiber, Registrar Thomas E. Dodamead, Director	Palatka
St. Leo College Rev. Stephen Herrmann, OSB, President	St. Leo
St. Petersburg Junior College Lois M. Smout, Dir. Finance & Services Donald J. Tolle, Dean of Instruction K. G. Skaggs, Vice-President & Dean Clearwater Division M. M. Bennett, President	St. Petersburg

GEORGIA

Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College J. Wilson Comer, President Tom M. Cordell, Dean and Dir. Short Courses Vernon Yow, Dean of Men and Prof. Forestry	Tifton
Columbus College Thomas Y. Whitley, President Lindsey Mock, Dir. Coun. and Guid. Mary V. Blackmon, Acting Dean of Women	Columbus

ILLINOIS

Monticello College Duncan Wimpress, President Gally E. Myers (Mr.), Vice-President	Alton

KENTUCKY

Caney Junior College William S. Hayes, Director of the College William R. Hughes, Registrar	Pippa Passes
Lees Junior College Frazier B. Adams, Dean Casey Morton	Jackson
Midway Junior College Travis D. Rawlings, Dean Mrs. Kenney R. Harper, Dean of Women	Midway

MARYLAND

Catonsville Community College Kenneth T. Stringer, Acad. Dean M. Graham Vinzent, Jr. Counselor	Baltimore
Montgomery Junior College Sadie G. Higgins, Ass't Dean/Admissions & Student Pers. Serv. William H. Neal, Registrar	Takoma Park

MISSISSIPPI

East Central B. L. Griffin, Business Manager Mrs. B. L. Griffin, Registrar	Decatur
Gulf Park College Amelia Lumkin, Registrar Irene E. Simmons, Dean of Students	Gulfport
Hinds Junior College Robert M. Mayo, Ass't to the President	Raymond
Holmes Junior College E. W. Wilson, Dean Robert O'Connor, Director of Guidance Mrs. E. W. Wilson, Teacher	Goodman
Meridian Municipal Junior College L. O. Todd, Superintendent of Schools R. Curtis Ulmer, Administrative Ass't to Superintendent	Meridian
Northeast Mississippi Junior College Earl F. Hargett, President E. Aubert Knight, Dean	Booneville

MISSOURI

Junior College of Flat River N. Gayle Simmons, Dean	Flat River
Joplin Junior College Margaret Mitchell, Registrar Lela Smith, Head, English Dept.	Joplin

NORTH CAROLINA

Asheville-Biltmore College Joseph M. Parsons, Academic Dean Jackson A. Owen, Dir. of Testing and Counseling Service Glenn L. Bushey, President	Asheville
Gaston Technical Institute W. Robert Halstead, Director Paul V. Smith, Registrar and Assistant to the Director	Gastonia
Mount Olive Junior College W. Burkette Raper, President	Mount Olive
Wingate Joel Herren, Business Manager S. G. Chappell, Dean Ralph C. Williams, Director of Student Affairs (Counseling) Ethel K. Smith, Librarian Larry H. Penley, Dir. News Bureau & Alumni Affairs	Wingate

SOUTH CAROLINA

Anderson Junior College William E. Tisdale, Administrative Assistant C. E. Butler, Academic Dean	Anderson

TENNESSEE

Hiwassee College Horace N. Barker, President James H. Ambargey, Dean W. D. Coleman, Business Manager	Madisonville

Martin — Palaski
    W. C. Westenberger, President
    John W. White, Registrar, Dir. of Student Affairs
    E. G. Boyd, Business Manager

Owen College — Memphis
    Leotis Peterman, Business Manager

VIRGINIA

Ferrum Junior College — Ferrum
    C. Ralph Arthur, President
    Sidney E. Sandridge, Director of Extension Dept.
    Otelia C. Gwaltney, Ass't Adm. to President

THE END

10-14